

275
(21)

VINDICATION

OF THE

REMARKS

ON THE

Bishop of DERRY's Discourse

ABOUT

HUMAN INVENTIONS,

From what is objected against them in the
Addition annexed to the Second Edition
of the Discourse.

By the Author of the REMARKS.

Printed for the Booksellers in *Dublin*, 1695.



To the Dissenting Inhabitants of the Diocess
of DERRY.

S*ince the Bishop of Derry has been pleas'd in his late Admonition to You, almost wholly to wave the Argument between Us, and to turn this Debate about your Worship into a Dispute about matters of Fact, nay since he has frequently appeal'd to your own Consciences for the Truth of what he has said concerning you, acknowledging, That it would be odd for him to think of imposing on you in matters you know so well, and that he can only hope to prevail on you by the Integrity of what he saith, See Admonition, p. 141, 148, 158, 159, 187, 188. I thought I cou'd not reasonably refuse to concur with him in referring the decision of this part of our Controversie to your selves, as the most competent and proper Judges, the matters controverted relating to your own or your Ministers publick practices. And I may now do it with the greater assurance, because you'l find all that I now assert attested by your own Ministers, (besides the particulars relating to your Communion attested by such as are Elders or principal Members in your Congregations.) And as they must doubtless know these matters better then the Bishop can do, who is never present at their Worship; so I may justly presume they are not so prodigal of their Reputation to the World, as to avouch so many things as True, which all their Hearers cou'd convict 'em of Falshood in, if they were not. I confess 'tis something hard that the Bp. shou'd thus put 'em to this double labour, of proving their Practice by Affidavits as well as defending it by Arguments. But when one is once engag'd with such unreasonable Disputants, there is no declining even such drudgery as this. For since the things which the Bp. objects against you are such*

as himself supposes, will prove scandalous to all that profess Christianity, If those Objections be founded on palpable misreports of your Practice, sure the just esteem of so many Christian Pastors and Churches deserves a modest Vindication. And indeed this Vindication had not been deferr'd so long, if the multiplicity of the particulars to be enquir'd into had not retarded it beyond expectation; And your Ministers were unwilling to run into so many Mistakes as the Bp. has unhappily done, by giving too hasty accounts of these matters upon slight Informations. I shall therefore freely leave this part of our Debate (which now lies between the Bp. and your own Ministers) to your impartial Examination. And that those Excellent Churches you are Members of, may under the vigilant care of such laborious Pastors, improve their external Rest and Peace, by walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, and thereby be both edify'd and multiplied, is the hearty desire of

Dear Brethren,

Your affectionate Brother

and Servant in our common Lord

J. B.

Mr. SINCLES LETTER

Referred to p. 14

SIR,

THe Argumentative and Historical parts of the Bp. of Derry's Admonition, seem both of a piece as to the many apparent mistakes in 'em. A satisfactory Answer to the former is justly expected from your self. But for the latter, as it's necessary to make use of the Information of others, who, I'm confident, will be more faithful to you, than the Bp's Informers have been to him: So I shall readily comply with your desire, to give a true and certain Account of the Practice of Dissenters in Waterford before the late Troubles: which was so very different, from that which his Lp. gives, when he says, p. 32, He had opportunity to enquire, and was told they did not Communicate above once a Year, if so often: That, (as he hath taught us in the former page) we may thence conclude the probability of what he says concerning others.

This account I'm more concerned and better enabled to give you with greater assurance; because I Preach't to 'em at that time, and have also carefully preserved a Memorial of such things in my Diary, which are as followeth.

I was Ordained a Pastor to that People about a year and a half before the Troubles, and Administr'd the Lords-Supper 5 times in 13 Months of that time, viz. December 18, 1687. May 6, 1688. July 15, 88. Octob. 28, 88. January 27, 88. Besides 4 times more, I administr'd that Sacrament the same Year to another Congregation, that was supplied by some Neighbouring Ministers and my self. And I can assure you, that those Ministers gave the Communion more frequently, most of 'em once a Month, some of 'em once in 2 Months to their own Congregations.

But that I may conceal nothing from you, that the Bp's Information may possibly be supposed to reach unto; I shall acquaint you, that abt the Dissenters in Waterford, both before I came

The Bp's objections against the Directory in reference to Baptism, considered from p. 34 to p. 37.

The Argument propos'd in the Remarks against the Cross, more fully stated from, p. 37. to p. 46.

The Bp's Answer to this Argument examin'd, p. 46, 47, 48.

The Bp's Argument to prove the use of the Cross in Baptism warranted by Scripture answered from p. 48 to p. 54.

Remarks on the Bp's Conclusion.

Mr. Sinclair's Letter concerning the practice of Dissenters in Waterford, as to the frequency of their Communion.

POSTSCRIPT.

WHereas the Bp. Admon. p. 69 asserts, *That some who have been found unqualified and insufficient for Learning by them, are received as Preachers among the Dissenters, after being rejected by them.* And adds, *that he has a notorious Example thereof since he came to this Diocese.* The Dissenting Ministers of his Diocese, declare they know of no such Person. And if the Bp. (as there is some ground to conjecture) mean *Mr Sq.* he declares he was never Examined as to his Learning by them; And besides that he is no Preacher in that part of the Kingdom most that know him, think that if his Lp shou'd reject all those of his Clergy that are not *Mr. Sq.* as superiors in Learning, he must exclude a great many of those that are now in his Diocese.

E R R A T A.
Two relating to the Rule of Worship which the Bp. pre-
p. 1. line 2. for unlawfulness read lawfulness p. 17.
36 blot out or. p. 36 l. 40, blot out bc. p. 39 l. 29, for
Instructions read Instructions p. 5 l. 10 penult; for the read a
p. 53 l. ult. for number read member.

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
REMARKS, &c.

In this Admonition of the Bishops we may consider the Introduction, The Three Heads he proposes to give an Account of; And The Reflections he adds on some passages in the Remarks.

IN the Introduction, His Lordship is pleas'd to insinuate, tho he does not venture directly to assert, *Admon. Obitore*
That I have treated the Opinions and Practices of the *Edir. p. 134.*
Establish'd Church in a passionate and angry, in a scoffing and deriding manner. But since he has given no Instances or Proof of it, but refer'd it to the Readers Judgment, I shall with some confidence appeal to it also, as being well assur'd of the Innocence of those Papers as to this Particular. Only, since he alledges a passage in his Discourse against this way of treating Controversies, I hope I may take the liberty of reciting one of my own, wherein I had taken care to obviate this Objection, 'Tis *Remarks, p. 142.* I do fully concur with him in his Advice, Not to treat one another with scurrilous and unseemly Reflections; But I hope he will not account those such wherein a Man is justly reprov'd for gross misrepresentations of other Men's Opinions or Practices, or a trifling Argument is not always treated with grimace, but sometimes with the slight it deserves. Let but the Reader make me this reasonable allowance, and I shall not be very fearful of his censure on this account.

For the 3 Heads which the Bp. proposes to give an Account of relating to the Remarks, I shall examine 'em in their Order.

I. He acquaints us with the true Motive that prevail'd with him to publish his Book in which these particulars are suggested.

1. He tells us how much Ignorance he found among the poor People, *Inasmuch as of 800 or more of the Dissenters Communion whom he personally Discourst he found not above 4 persons that cou'd give any Account of their Catechism, and only 2 that cou'd repeat it.*
Admon. p. 135

Now as to this matter of fact which the Bp professes *mov'd his compassion*, I shall give him the Account sent me by the Dissenting Ministers that are in his Diocess, and I hope that Christian Charity which he so often professes will render it very welcom to him by assuring him that the generality of 'em are not so ignorant as he has mistaken 'em to be.

We can give no Account how many persons the Bp. has examin'd, but we know several whom he did examine that had the Assemblies Catechism, and cou'd both give an Account of it and repeat it, but wou'd not partly because they heard him so enveigh against it that they judg'd he question'd 'em rather to affront than edify 'em, and partly because they were not free to subject themselves to an Examination he pretend'd to make as their Pastor. But to evidence how little ground he had to suppose 'em so generally ignorant of their Catechism. If we may be allow'd to judg of other Congregations in the Diocess by those 2 in the Parish of *Temple-more* (alias *Derry*) where he resides, and may be suppos'd to have examin'd the greatest Number, We can on good grounds affirm there are in those 2 Congregations 600 who can give a good Account of and repeat the Assembly's Catechism; And we know of few in any of our Congregations that cannot repeat the Creed, the Lord's prayer and the Ten Commandments.

Now if this Account of their own Ministers who shou'd be best acquainted with their own People be true, the Bps. Account is absolutely incredible, unless he has taken some extraordinary pains to pick out the most ignorant Dissenters of his Diocess, that by them he might pretend to judg of the rest. But any one that considers the genius of that People, and their particular dissatisfaction with his Lp. will be easily inclin'd to believe this genuine Account of the matter; That he has mistaken their Silence for their Ignorance, and concluded they cou'd not repeat their Catechism because they wou'd not admit him to be their Catechizer.

2. He computes, that there being but 9 Meetings in the Diocess, (and taking one Meeting-house and one Lords-day with another) not 300 at each Meeting, and there being 30000 Dissenters in the Diocess, It may be thence concluded, that only one in Ten or thereabouts go to worship God any where, on the Lord's-day; And this he professes was a great grief to him.

Now as to this matter of fact, I hope, the Bp. cannot take it unkindly that I endeavour to allay his grief, by offering him the following Account from the Dissenting Ministers in his Diocess.

In the Parish of *Temple-more* alias *Derry*, there are, 2 Meetings in which, there will be found above 2400 who ordinarily worship God every Lord's-day. For tho every one of these does not attend every Lords-day, because some of 'em must be left to secure their houses, yet there and more

more are ordinary Hearers, as the Ministers of those Congregations can undeniably prove by their Examination-Rolls. Nay the least Congregation among us are ordinarily 600, and some above a 1000 that do worship God every Lord's-day together. So that where Ministers are settled in Parishes, we do not know of one in 20, that do not ordinarily attend on publick worship. And for those which the Bp. saith have not been at any publick worship these seven years, we know none such of our Communion; And for those places that are not furnish'd with Ministers. The Ministers that are settled supply 'em as frequently as their work in their own Congregations can allow.

Now if this Account be true, The Bps. Computation, and the Conclusion he draws from it is far enough from being so. And that there are yet some Congregations that want Ministers, and can only have occasional supplies, is much more their grief, who are doing all they can to remedy it, then it can be supposed to be his Lp's. who does all he can to lessen the Number of their Meetings, by obliging his Tenants to suffer neither Ministers nor Meeting houses to be upon his Land.

3. The Bp. pretends, That his Book contains an *Admon. p. 137*. Answer to what he found objected by those of the Dissenters that he convers'd with against the ordinary Lord's day worship in the Establish'd Church, and that he confin'd himself to what he had seen and known to be their Opinion and Practice.

Answer. 'Tis evident by Mr. Craghead's Reply to his Discourse which taxes him with the same Calumnys as the Remarks, that if those Dissenters he convers't with, gave him that account he pretends of these matters; They were such as understood not the known Opinions or Practices of their own Teachers. As when they alledg so many Reasons either against the Unlawfulness of all Forms of Prayer, and against joyning in publick worship where any are us'd, or against the publick Reading the Scriptures, or against all bodily worship, &c. And therefore if the Bp. had been ingenious in prosecuting what he now saith was his design, he shou'd have told us, That he intended only by this Book to correct the mistakes of a few ignorant People, that neither knew the Judgment of their Pastors, nor the common Practice of the Congregations they joyn'd with. And that he intended not to charge the generality of the Dissenters, even not those of his own Diocess with those weak Opinions, and weaker Arguments and Objections which he endeavours to censure and confute. But he has been so far from doing this, that tho' in the Conclusion of his Book he particularly addresses himself to those of his Diocess, yet in his very Entrance on his Subject, he undertakes to represent the Practice of Dissenters in general, or (in his own terms) of them that differ from the Establish'd Church. Nay where he supposes his Charge only to be true of those in the North of Ireland, he takes care to confine it to 'em; And therefore he gives us just ground to conclude that where he mentions the Dissenters without any such Restriction he is to be understood as speaking of the whole Body of 'em, according to the very Titles of his several Chapters, *Praise, Prayer, Hearing, Bodily-Worship, how practis'd among Dissenters*. And to convince him of the Reasonableness of this, I shall put a Parallel case to him.

Suppose

Suppose I shou'd write a Book about Ecclesiastical Discipline how Practis'd in the Establish'd Church; and among Dissenters. And in the account of the Practice of the Establish'd Church shou'd represent the sad neglect of all the Duties of their Function both by Bishops and Priests, and accordingly shou'd charge the Bishops with so many years Non-residence in which there had been no Consecration of Churches, nor Confirmation of Children; nor Ordination of Priests, and the Priests with such neglect of their Cures, as a great many in the Diocess of Down and Connor were accus'd of; And suppose I shou'd particularly address this Book to the late Bishop and Clergy of that Diocess, Wou'd his Lp. in this case think me excusable from the guilt of Calumniating, because I had particularly address'd this Discourse to them, when I have not in the body of the Book confin'd my accusations to them, but speak all along of the faults of the Conformable Bishops and Clergy in general without any such particular limitation, or wou'd he think me ingenuous in producing such Arguments as the Bishop and Clergy of the foremention'd Diocess may alledg to excuse themselves as the common Reasonings of the Conforming Clergy. And yet this were of the two more justifiable than the Bp's. management of this charge against Dissenters: in which he has wrong'd the generality even of those to whom he now pretends that this Discourse was confin'd, but much more the generality of the Dissenters, against whom the greatest part of his Book is levell'd without any distinction. I confess to have told us plainly that he only confuted the weak Discourses he had met with among some few of the Dissenting Laity wou'd have lessen'd the character of his Book by supposing the cause of the Dissenters to be little concern'd in it; And so probably the main design of it to blast the reputation of the whole Party had been frustrated by such an ingenuous Confession. But without such an ingenuous Confession I do not see how 'tis possible to excuse his Discourse from untruth and dissingenuity; either in attributing to Dissenters in general, what is peculiar to those in the North of Ireland (as in the Head of frequent Communion.) or in ascribing to a whole party without distinction, so many Opinions, Arguments and Practices, as either none at all; or none but very weak and ignorant People are chargeable with, of which there are so many to be found in all persuasions that he who will measure the rest of their Communion by 'em. can never want matter enough to expose the Wildest and Soberest or body of Christians whatsoever. So that shou'd we allow the Truth of all his Lp. here suggests; (viz. that he truly represents what the Dissenters he convers't with alledg'd to him) It appears how little this signifies to clear him from the guilt of groundless Aspersions.

II. The Bp. proposes to shew, *That I have granted the Adm. p. 138. principal things designed in his Book.* As to these I assure him that I see no reason to retract any of those Concessions I have really made, and if they will be of any use to reconcile sober Protestants to more charitable thoughts of each others Worship, I shall rejoice in it. But then I must desire him not to stretch 'em beyond their just bounds; as he seems to do in the following Particulars.

Thus.

Thus, tho I have own'd Singing in Public (as oppos'd to Church Music) lawful in general, yet as to the Practice of it in Cathedrals, whereon the main part of the Auditory is excluded from going in the public Praises thro their incapacity to sing, and as Profane & irreverend & disagreeable to the Apostles Rule of doing all to Edification, p. 23.

So tho I have granted Responses in general Lawful, Yet I have censur'd the method of 'em in the Parish Churches as applied to all Psalms, as not only unscriptural but unreasonable and disorderly. p. 23.

As to the 4th Concession, Tho I think not those unscriptural Practices of singing Psalms by a Quire and of Responses in the Parish Churches to fall within the Compass of what our Lord censures. Mark 7. Yet I think 'em a very defective and disorderly way of Worship; To which I judge the more Scriptural way Practis'd among the Dissenters far Preferable.

For the 5th Concession, Tho I grant Praying with or without a Form in general undetermin'd in Scripture; Yet I do not think it only a matter of convenience. For I doubt not Praying with a Form is a Duty to those that cannot Pray without it, and I think it sinful to exclude necessary matters of Prayer by confining our selves to a Form when we can Pray without one.

From Concession the 6th he draws a wrong Inference which I had particularly obviated, viz. That because God prescribed a form of words to the Jews in some extraordinary parts of Worship; Therefore he doe in particular command Christian Pastors and their Flocks to Pray to Him in Forms. For that must be the sense of his Lp's Inference if it be any thing to his purpose. For I have challeng'd him to produce any Form prescribed to the Christian Church except the Lords Prayer, or any particular Command for the constant use of that in publick. And for its being sometimes us'd as a Form the Westminster-Assembly in their larger Catechism declare their Judgment for it.

For Concession the 8th, I do not own (as his Lp. here alleges) that there is no Reading of Scripture in the North of Ireland in the Winter Quarter. For tho this Exercise is in some places forborn during the Winter Quarter, yet it is not in all, and particularly but in one Meeting in all his Lp's Diocess, the rest continuing it thro the whole Winter. Of which I shall have occasion to take notice afterwards.

For Concession the 9th, tho I have own'd that Bodily Worship is commanded in Scripture, yet I have not own'd but censur'd it as Practis'd by such as bow towards the East or Altar, or at the Name of Jesus.

For Concession the 10th, tho I do not condemn kneeling in the Act of Receiving as unlawful, yet I have shew'd it to be disagreeable to Scripture Example, and by the strictness of the Bp's own Rule unlawfull too. p. 123.

The 3d Thing the Bp. proposes, is to shew, That whereas there are several matters of Fact which he affirms, and I deny; The mistake lies on my side, notwithstanding I impute 'em to him with great Assurance as falsehoods, &c. Admon. p. 141.

What I have charg'd him with as *unlawful*, in reference to the *Dissenters in general*, it is not on me to make good. What relates to those in the *North of Ireland*, as I have asserted nothing but upon their Information. So I can produce no other *Witnesses* than themselves. And sure I need not produce any other, since their Testimony concerning their own Practice must by all reasonable Men be allow'd to be of greater weight and credit than his Lp's who cannot pretend to know so well as themselves what is done by themselves.

This promise I come to examine the matters of Fact wherein the Bp. attempts to vindicate himself, tho they are but a small part of what I have charg'd him with Misrepresenting.

For the Two first matters of Fact, I shall take the liberty to offer 'em in the same order and in the very words of his Discourse, p. 83. 84. Edit. Quarto.

But the most sad and deplorable defect of your performance of this Duty, is the cutting out the Reading of the Word of God from most of your publick Assemblies, directly contrary to God's Institution and Ordinance for the Instruction of his Church; Inasmuch that in many of your Meetings, setting aside a Verse or Two for a Text or Quotation at the discretion of the Teacher; The Word of God is never Publickly heard among 'em. This is matter of Fact and undeniable. And in all the Meetings of the North of Ireland in a whole Year, perhaps there is not so much Scripture Read, as in one day in our Church by the strictest Enquiry I could make. *Disc. p. 83, 84. and U. p. 84.* The Dissenters banish the Word of God out of their Meetings. Sure 'tis a sad thing that a Man may go to most Meetings many Years and never hear one entire Chapter Read in 'em.

It is here obvious that his main and positive Accusation is, That the Dissenters have cut off the Reading of the Word of God out of most of their Meetings, *Disc. p. 83, 84.* setting aside a verse or two for a Text or Quotation at the discretion of the Teacher, *Disc. p. 83, 84.* and that in many of 'em never publickly heard among 'em. And that a Man may go to most Meetings many Years and never hear one entire Chapter Read in 'em. *Disc. p. 83, 84.* This Accusation he more particularly fixes on the Meetings in the North of Ireland.

In opposition to this Accusation I had told him, 'Tis Remarks, p. 92, 93. the general Practice of the Dissenting Ministers in the North of Ireland, for about Three quarters of the Year, (For in the most, the Winter quarter is only excepted) to Read every Morning an entire portion of Scripture, usually a whole Chapter, at least so much of one as they can go thro with in an Exposition of half an hours length.

The very same matter of Fact; The Revd. Mr. Crashead has affirm'd in his Answer, and more largely, without excepting the Winter quarter, since in his Diocess all the Dissenting Ministers except one continue their Lecturing thro the whole Year.

Now this matter of Fact all the world must allow to be directly contrary to his severe charge; so that if it prove true, His Lp. could have no pretence to complain of my Reproving him for offering such barefaced assertions for undeniable matters of Fact.

Let's

Let's then enquire what he hath said to make good his Charge; And to that purpose he alledges 2 Things.

1. That the Reading the Scriptures shou'd be so order'd, that the diligent Hearers may in a competent time be acquainted with the whole Body of 'em; Whereupon he challenges me to produce one Meeting in the North where this has been observ'd. *Adm. p. 144*

As to this Allegation, 'tis evident that it concerns not the matter of Fact in dispute at all, which is, *whether setting aside a verse or 2 for a Text or Quotation of the Scripture, the voice of God is never publicly heard among 'em; and a Verse may attend most Hearings many Years and never hear an entire Chapter Read in 'em.* For the Allegation concerns only the manner of Reading 'em, whereas the Accusation supposes 'em not Read at all, except a verse or 2 for a Text or Quotation, &c. so that I might justly dismiss any farther consideration of it. But since the Bp. gives me this occasion to compare their Practice and ours, I shall suggest to him, That tho' we Read not so much of Scripture as they in such entire Portions as whole Chapters, yet we Read the Scriptures more regularly than they, and a Man may sooner hear 'em Read thro' in a Meeting than he can in most of the Parish Churches. To clear this, I must premise, That in the generality of the Parish Churches thro' the Kingdom, there is no Divine Service Read except on Sundays. Now if we consult the *Statute in the Common-Burye-Buch* We shall find, that (excepting the *Psalm*) There is never Read from one generation to another, but about 101 Chapters of the Old Testament, and that in such order or rather disorder as breaks the coherence of the sacred History. So that a Man may if he liv'd 80 Years attend the publick Worship in most Parish Churches all his Days, and never hear the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st, 32nd, 33rd, 34th, 35th, 36th, 37th, 38th, 39th, 40th, 41st, 42nd, 43rd, 44th, 45th, 46th, 47th, 48th, 49th, 50th, 51st, 52nd, 53rd, 54th, 55th, 56th, 57th, 58th, 59th, 60th, 61st, 62nd, 63rd, 64th, 65th, 66th, 67th, 68th, 69th, 70th, 71st, 72nd, 73rd, 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, 82nd, 83rd, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th, 90th, 91st, 92nd, 93rd, 94th, 95th, 96th, 97th, 98th, 99th, 100th, 101st, 102nd, 103rd, 104th, 105th, 106th, 107th, 108th, 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th, 113th, 114th, 115th, 116th, 117th, 118th, 119th, 120th, 121st, 122nd, 123rd, 124th, 125th, 126th, 127th, 128th, 129th, 130th, 131st, 132nd, 133rd, 134th, 135th, 136th, 137th, 138th, 139th, 140th, 141st, 142nd, 143rd, 144th, 145th, 146th, 147th, 148th, 149th, 150th, 151st, 152nd, 153rd, 154th, 155th, 156th, 157th, 158th, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 163rd, 164th, 165th, 166th, 167th, 168th, 169th, 170th, 171st, 172nd, 173rd, 174th, 175th, 176th, 177th, 178th, 179th, 180th, 181st, 182nd, 183rd, 184th, 185th, 186th, 187th, 188th, 189th, 190th, 191st, 192nd, 193rd, 194th, 195th, 196th, 197th, 198th, 199th, 200th, 201st, 202nd, 203rd, 204th, 205th, 206th, 207th, 208th, 209th, 210th, 211st, 212nd, 213th, 214th, 215th, 216th, 217th, 218th, 219th, 220th, 221st, 222nd, 223rd, 224th, 225th, 226th, 227th, 228th, 229th, 230th, 231st, 232nd, 233rd, 234th, 235th, 236th, 237th, 238th, 239th, 240th, 241st, 242nd, 243rd, 244th, 245th, 246th, 247th, 248th, 249th, 250th, 251st, 252nd, 253rd, 254th, 255th, 256th, 257th, 258th, 259th, 260th, 261st, 262nd, 263rd, 264th, 265th, 266th, 267th, 268th, 269th, 270th, 271st, 272nd, 273rd, 274th, 275th, 276th, 277th, 278th, 279th, 280th, 281st, 282nd, 283rd, 284th, 285th, 286th, 287th, 288th, 289th, 290th, 291st, 292nd, 293rd, 294th, 295th, 296th, 297th, 298th, 299th, 300th, 301st, 302nd, 303rd, 304th, 305th, 306th, 307th, 308th, 309th, 310th, 311st, 312nd, 313th, 314th, 315th, 316th, 317th, 318th, 319th, 320th, 321st, 322nd, 323rd, 324th, 325th, 326th, 327th, 328th, 329th, 330th, 331st, 332nd, 333rd, 334th, 335th, 336th, 337th, 338th, 339th, 340th, 341st, 342nd, 343rd, 344th, 345th, 346th, 347th, 348th, 349th, 350th, 351st, 352nd, 353rd, 354th, 355th, 356th, 357th, 358th, 359th, 360th, 361st, 362nd, 363rd, 364th, 365th, 366th, 367th, 368th, 369th, 370th, 371st, 372nd, 373rd, 374th, 375th, 376th, 377th, 378th, 379th, 380th, 381st, 382nd, 383rd, 384th, 385th, 386th, 387th, 388th, 389th, 390th, 391st, 392nd, 393rd, 394th, 395th, 396th, 397th, 398th, 399th, 400th, 401st, 402nd, 403rd, 404th, 405th, 406th, 407th, 408th, 409th, 410th, 411st, 412nd, 413th, 414th, 415th, 416th, 417th, 418th, 419th, 420th, 421st, 422nd, 423rd, 424th, 425th, 426th, 427th, 428th, 429th, 430th, 431st, 432nd, 433rd, 434th, 435th, 436th, 437th, 438th, 439th, 440th, 441st, 442nd, 443rd, 444th, 445th, 446th, 447th, 448th, 449th, 450th, 451st, 452nd, 453rd, 454th, 455th, 456th, 457th, 458th, 459th, 460th, 461st, 462nd, 463rd, 464th, 465th, 466th, 467th, 468th, 469th, 470th, 471st, 472nd, 473rd, 474th, 475th, 476th, 477th, 478th, 479th, 480th, 481st, 482nd, 483rd, 484th, 485th, 486th, 487th, 488th, 489th, 490th, 491st, 492nd, 493rd, 494th, 495th, 496th, 497th, 498th, 499th, 500th, 501st, 502nd, 503rd, 504th, 505th, 506th, 507th, 508th, 509th, 510th, 511st, 512nd, 513th, 514th, 515th, 516th, 517th, 518th, 519th, 520th, 521st, 522nd, 523rd, 524th, 525th, 526th, 527th, 528th, 529th, 530th, 531st, 532nd, 533rd, 534th, 535th, 536th, 537th, 538th, 539th, 540th, 541st, 542nd, 543rd, 544th, 545th, 546th, 547th, 548th, 549th, 550th, 551st, 552nd, 553rd, 554th, 555th, 556th, 557th, 558th, 559th, 560th, 561st, 562nd, 563rd, 564th, 565th, 566th, 567th, 568th, 569th, 570th, 571st, 572nd, 573rd, 574th, 575th, 576th, 577th, 578th, 579th, 580th, 581st, 582nd, 583rd, 584th, 585th, 586th, 587th, 588th, 589th, 590th, 591st, 592nd, 593rd, 594th, 595th, 596th, 597th, 598th, 599th, 600th, 601st, 602nd, 603rd, 604th, 605th, 606th, 607th, 608th, 609th, 610th, 611st, 612nd, 613th, 614th, 615th, 616th, 617th, 618th, 619th, 620th, 621st, 622nd, 623rd, 624th, 625th, 626th, 627th, 628th, 629th, 630th, 631st, 632nd, 633rd, 634th, 635th, 636th, 637th, 638th, 639th, 640th, 641st, 642nd, 643rd, 644th, 645th, 646th, 647th, 648th, 649th, 650th, 651st, 652nd, 653rd, 654th, 655th, 656th, 657th, 658th, 659th, 660th, 661st, 662nd, 663rd, 664th, 665th, 666th, 667th, 668th, 669th, 670th, 671st, 672nd, 673rd, 674th, 675th, 676th, 677th, 678th, 679th, 680th, 681st, 682nd, 683rd, 684th, 685th, 686th, 687th, 688th, 689th, 690th, 691st, 692nd, 693rd, 694th, 695th, 696th, 697th, 698th, 699th, 700th, 701st, 702nd, 703rd, 704th, 705th, 706th, 707th, 708th, 709th, 710th, 711st, 712nd, 713th, 714th, 715th, 716th, 717th, 718th, 719th, 720th, 721st, 722nd, 723rd, 724th, 725th, 726th, 727th, 728th, 729th, 730th, 731st, 732nd, 733rd, 734th, 735th, 736th, 737th, 738th, 739th, 740th, 741st, 742nd, 743rd, 744th, 745th, 746th, 747th, 748th, 749th, 750th, 751st, 752nd, 753rd, 754th, 755th, 756th, 757th, 758th, 759th, 760th, 761st, 762nd, 763rd, 764th, 765th, 766th, 767th, 768th, 769th, 770th, 771st, 772nd, 773rd, 774th, 775th, 776th, 777th, 778th, 779th, 780th, 781st, 782nd, 783rd, 784th, 785th, 786th, 787th, 788th, 789th, 790th, 791st, 792nd, 793rd, 794th, 795th, 796th, 797th, 798th, 799th, 800th, 801st, 802nd, 803rd, 804th, 805th, 806th, 807th, 808th, 809th, 810th, 811st, 812nd, 813th, 814th, 815th, 816th, 817th, 818th, 819th, 820th, 821st, 822nd, 823rd, 824th, 825th, 826th, 827th, 828th, 829th, 830th, 831st, 832nd, 833rd, 834th, 835th, 836th, 837th, 838th, 839th, 840th, 841st, 842nd, 843rd, 844th, 845th, 846th, 847th, 848th, 849th, 850th, 851st, 852nd, 853rd, 854th, 855th, 856th, 857th, 858th, 859th, 860th, 861st, 862nd, 863rd, 864th, 865th, 866th, 867th, 868th, 869th, 870th, 871st, 872nd, 873rd, 874th, 875th, 876th, 877th, 878th, 879th, 880th, 881st, 882nd, 883rd, 884th, 885th, 886th, 887th, 888th, 889th, 890th, 891st, 892nd, 893rd, 894th, 895th, 896th, 897th, 898th, 899th, 900th, 901st, 902nd, 903rd, 904th, 905th, 906th, 907th, 908th, 909th, 910th, 911st, 912nd, 913th, 914th, 915th, 916th, 917th, 918th, 919th, 920th, 921st, 922nd, 923rd, 924th, 925th, 926th, 927th, 928th, 929th, 930th, 931st, 932nd, 933rd, 934th, 935th, 936th, 937th, 938th, 939th, 940th, 941st, 942nd, 943rd, 944th, 945th, 946th, 947th, 948th, 949th, 950th, 951st, 952nd, 953rd, 954th, 955th, 956th, 957th, 958th, 959th, 960th, 961st, 962nd, 963rd, 964th, 965th, 966th, 967th, 968th, 969th, 970th, 971st, 972nd, 973rd, 974th, 975th, 976th, 977th, 978th, 979th, 980th, 981st, 982nd, 983rd, 984th, 985th, 986th, 987th, 988th, 989th, 990th, 991st, 992nd, 993rd, 994th, 995th, 996th, 997th, 998th, 999th, 1000th, 1001st, 1002nd, 1003rd, 1004th, 1005th, 1006th, 1007th, 1008th, 1009th, 1010th, 1011st, 1012nd, 1013th, 1014th, 1015th, 1016th, 1017th, 1018th, 1019th, 1020th, 1021st, 1022nd, 1023rd, 1024th, 1025th, 1026th, 1027th, 1028th, 1029th, 1030th, 1031st, 1032nd, 1033rd, 1034th, 1035th, 1036th, 1037th, 1038th, 1039th, 1040th, 1041st, 1042nd, 1043rd, 1044th, 1045th, 1046th, 1047th, 1048th, 1049th, 1050th, 1051st, 1052nd, 1053rd, 1054th, 1055th, 1056th, 1057th, 1058th, 1059th, 1060th, 1061st, 1062nd, 1063rd, 1064th, 1065th, 1066th, 1067th, 1068th, 1069th, 1070th, 1071st, 1072nd, 1073rd, 1074th, 1075th, 1076th, 1077th, 1078th, 1079th, 1080th, 1081st, 1082nd, 1083rd, 1084th, 1085th, 1086th, 1087th, 1088th, 1089th, 1090th, 1091st, 1092nd, 1093rd, 1094th, 1095th, 1096th, 1097th, 1098th, 1099th, 1100th, 1101st, 1102nd, 1103rd, 1104th, 1105th, 1106th, 1107th, 1108th, 1109th, 1110th, 1111st, 1112nd, 1113th, 1114th, 1115th, 1116th, 1117th, 1118th, 1119th, 1120th, 1121st, 1122nd, 1123rd, 1124th, 1125th, 1126th, 1127th, 1128th, 1129th, 1130th, 1131st, 1132nd, 1133rd, 1134th, 1135th, 1136th, 1137th, 1138th, 1139th, 1140th, 1141st, 1142nd, 1143rd, 1144th, 1145th, 1146th, 1147th, 1148th, 1149th, 1150th, 1151st, 1152nd, 1153rd, 1154th, 1155th, 1156th, 1157th, 1158th, 1159th, 1160th, 1161st, 1162nd, 1163rd, 1164th, 1165th, 1166th, 1167th, 1168th, 1169th, 1170th, 1171st, 1172nd, 1173rd, 1174th, 1175th, 1176th, 1177th, 1178th, 1179th, 1180th, 1181st, 1182nd, 1183rd, 1184th, 1185th, 1186th, 1187th, 1188th, 1189th, 1190th, 1191st, 1192nd, 1193rd, 1194th, 1195th, 1196th, 1197th, 1198th, 1199th, 1200th, 1201st, 1202nd, 1203rd, 1204th, 1205th, 1206th, 1207th, 1208th, 1209th, 1210th, 1211st, 1212nd, 1213th, 1214th, 1215th, 1216th, 1217th, 1218th, 1219th, 1220th, 1221st, 1222nd, 1223rd, 1224th, 1225th, 1226th, 1227th, 1228th, 1229th, 1230th, 1231st, 1232nd, 1233rd, 1234th, 1235th, 1236th, 1237th, 1238th, 1239th, 1240th, 1241st, 1242nd, 1243rd, 1244th, 1245th, 1246th, 1247th, 1248th, 1249th, 1250th, 1251st, 1252nd, 1253rd, 1254th, 1255th, 1256th, 1257th, 1258th, 1259th, 1260th, 1261st, 1262nd, 1263rd, 1264th, 1265th, 1266th, 1267th, 1268th, 1269th, 1270th, 1271st, 1272nd, 1273rd, 1274th, 1275th, 1276th, 1277th, 1278th, 1279th, 1280th, 1281st, 1282nd, 1283rd, 1284th, 1285th, 1286th, 1287th, 1288th, 1289th, 1290th, 1291st, 1292nd, 1293rd, 1294th, 1295th, 1296th, 1297th, 1298th, 1299th, 1300th, 1301st, 1302nd, 1303rd, 1304th, 1305th, 1306th, 1307th, 1308th, 1309th, 1310th, 1311st, 1312nd, 1313th, 1314th, 1315th, 1316th, 1317th, 1318th, 1319th, 1320th, 1321st, 1322nd, 1323rd, 1324th, 1325th, 1326th, 1327th, 1328th, 1329th, 1330th, 1331st, 1332nd, 1333rd, 1334th, 1335th, 1336th, 1337th, 1338th, 1339th, 1340th, 1341st, 1342nd, 1343rd, 1344th, 1345th, 1346th, 1347th, 1348th, 1349th, 1350th, 1351st, 1352nd, 1353rd, 1354th, 1355th, 1356th, 1357th, 1358th, 1359th, 1360th, 1361st, 1362nd, 1363rd, 1364th, 1365th, 1366th, 1367th, 1368th, 1369th, 1370th, 1371st, 1372nd, 1373rd, 1374th, 1375th, 1376th, 1377th, 1378th, 1379th, 1380th, 1381st, 1382nd, 1383rd, 1384th, 1385th, 1386th, 1387th, 1388th, 1389th, 1390th, 1391st, 1392nd, 1393rd, 1394th, 1395th, 1396th, 1397th, 1398th, 1399th, 1400th, 1401st, 1402nd, 1403rd, 1404th, 1405th, 1406th, 1407th, 1408th, 1409th, 1410th, 1411st, 1412nd, 1413th, 1414th, 1415th, 1416th, 1417th, 1418th, 1419th, 1420th, 1421st, 1422nd, 1423rd, 1424th, 1425th, 1426th, 1427th, 1428th, 1429th, 1430th, 1431st, 1432nd, 1433rd, 1434th, 1435th, 1436th, 1437th, 1438th, 1439th, 1440th, 1441st, 1442nd, 1443rd, 1444th, 1445th, 1446th, 1447th, 1448th, 1449th, 1450th, 1451st, 1452nd, 1453rd, 1454th, 1455th, 1456th, 1457th, 1458th, 1459th, 1460th, 1461st, 1462nd, 1463rd, 1464th, 1465th, 1466th, 1467th, 1468th, 1469th, 1470th, 1471st, 1472nd, 1473rd, 1474th, 1475th, 1476th, 1477th, 1478th, 1479th, 1480th, 1481st, 1482nd, 1483rd, 1484th, 1485th, 1486th, 1487th, 1488th, 1489th, 1490th, 1491st, 1492nd, 1493rd, 1494th, 1495th, 1496th, 1497th, 1498th, 1499th, 1500th, 1501st, 1502nd, 1503rd, 1504th, 1505th, 1506th, 1507th, 1508th, 1509th, 1510th, 1511st, 1512nd, 1513th, 1514th, 1515th, 1516th, 1517th, 1518th, 1519th, 1520th, 1521st, 1522nd, 1523rd, 1524th, 1525th, 1526th, 1527th, 1528th, 1529th, 1530th, 1531st, 1532nd, 1533rd, 1534th, 1535th, 1536th, 1537th, 1538th, 1539th, 1540th, 1541st, 1542nd, 1543rd, 1544th, 1545th, 1546th, 1547th, 1548th, 1549th, 1550th, 1551st, 1552nd, 1553rd, 1554th, 1555th, 1556th, 1557th, 1558th, 1559th, 1560th, 1561st, 1562nd, 1563rd, 1564th, 1565th, 1566th, 1567th, 1568th, 1569th, 1570th, 1571st, 1572nd, 1573rd, 1574th, 1575th, 1576th, 1577th, 1578th, 1579th, 1580th, 1581st, 1582nd, 1583rd, 1584th, 1585th, 1586th, 1587th, 1588th, 1589th, 1590th, 1591st, 1592nd, 1593rd, 1594th, 1595th, 1596th, 1597th, 1598th, 1599th, 1600th, 1601st, 1602nd, 1603rd, 1604th, 1605th, 1606th, 1607th, 1608th, 1609th, 1610th, 1611st, 1612nd, 1613th, 1614th, 1615th, 1616th, 1617th, 1618th, 1619th, 1620th, 1621st, 1622nd, 1623rd, 1624th, 1625th, 1626th, 1627th, 1628th, 1629th, 1630th, 1631st, 1632nd, 1633rd, 1634th, 1635th, 1636th, 1637th, 1638th, 1639th, 1640th, 1641st, 1642nd, 1643rd, 1644th, 1645th, 1646th, 1647th, 1648th, 1649th, 1650th, 1651st, 1652nd, 1653rd, 1654th, 1655th, 1656th, 1657th, 1658th, 1659th, 1660th, 1661st, 1662nd, 1663rd, 1664th, 1665th, 1666th, 1667th, 1668th, 1669th, 1670th, 1671st, 1672nd, 1673rd, 1674th, 1675th, 1676th, 1677th, 1678th, 1679th, 1680th, 1681st, 1682nd, 1683rd, 1684th, 1685th, 1686th, 1687th, 1688th, 1689th, 1690th, 1691st, 1692nd, 1693rd, 1694th, 1695th, 1696th, 1697th, 1698th, 1699th, 1700th, 1701st, 1702nd, 1703rd, 1704th, 1705th, 1706th, 1707th, 1708th, 1709th, 1710th, 1711st, 1712nd, 1713th, 1714th, 1715th, 1716th, 1717th, 1718th, 1719th, 1720th, 1721st, 1722nd, 1723rd, 1724th, 1725th, 1726th, 1727th, 1728th, 1729th, 1730th, 1731st, 1732nd, 1733rd, 1734th, 1735th, 1736th, 1737th, 1738th, 1739th, 1740th, 1741st, 1742nd, 1743rd, 1744th, 1745th, 1746th, 1747th, 1748th, 1749th, 1750th, 1751st, 1752nd, 1753rd, 1754th, 1755th, 1756th, 1757th, 1758th, 1759th, 1760th, 1761st, 1762nd, 1763rd, 1764th, 1765th, 1766th, 1767th, 1768th, 1769th, 1770th, 1771st, 1772nd, 1773rd, 1774th, 1775th, 1776th, 1777th, 1778th, 1779th, 1780th, 1781st, 1782nd, 1783rd, 1784th, 1785th, 1786th, 1787th, 1788th, 1789th, 1790th, 1791st, 1792nd, 1793rd, 1794th, 1795th, 1796th, 1797th, 1798th, 1799th, 1800th, 1801st, 1802nd, 1803rd, 1804th, 1805th, 1806th, 1807th, 1808th, 1809th, 1810th, 1811st, 1812nd, 1813th, 1814th, 1815th, 1816th, 1817th, 1818th, 1819th, 1820th, 1821st, 1822nd, 1823rd, 1824th, 1825th, 1826th, 1827th, 1828th, 1829th, 1830th, 1831st, 1832nd, 1833rd, 1834th, 1835th, 1836th, 1837th, 1838th, 1839th, 1840th, 1841st, 1842nd, 1843rd, 1844th, 1

Adm. p. 144. *He said on him; But till the time and place be nam'd, His Assertion he saith is literally true and in a larger sense than he express'd it.*

ib. 145. I must desire his Lp. to review this passage, and tell us, *Whether it be literally true that except a Verse or 2 for a Text, or Quotation, the voice of God is never Publickly heard in their Meetings, when 'tis (as Mr. Craghead informs him) their ordinary Practice to Lecture every Lords-day and usually to Read a whole Chapter, or divide a long one that's full of Textuall difficulties? Is a whole Chapter or half a long one, only a verse or 2 for a Text? Nay Is it literally true; That a Man may go to most Meetings many Years, and never Hear an entire Chapter Read, when in the generality of 'em he shall most commonly Hear a whole one Read every Lords-day? But what does he mean when he challenges me to name the time and place in which any entire portion of Scripture was Read but what was either design'd for a Text to a Lecture or a Sermon? What is this to the matter of Fact that he asserted? For besides that a Text to a Lecture is a new phrase, Is a whole Chapter or half a long one only a verse in 2? Or is a whole Chapter never Read, because it's always Read with a design to expound it? Nay is this so deplorable a fault as he has suppos'd it, that we never Read an entire portion of Scripture without intending to illustrate the sense of it by comparing parallel Scriptures with it (For that's all his Lp. can mean by our making it a Text to a Lecture)? Is it not rather our great commendation, That the Scripture is always Interpreted as well as Read, and rather matter of Reproach to others that 'tis barely Read, without giving the People any such help to understand it? And shall one extraordinary diligence be made our deplorable sin? And their sloth so great a virtue? And upon the whole wou'd it not have been more ingenuous in him to own that his Informers had grossly impos'd upon him, then to persist in so plain a mistake, and then colour it over with an Apology the weakness and unreasonableness whereof had been so largely and justly expos'd in that part of the Remarks to which he has not yet thought fit to give any Answer?*

But tho the Bp. be in the wrong as to the substance of the Accusation, He seems very confident of what he has said to Vindicate that circumstance of it, viz. *That in all the Meetings of the North in a whole Year perhaps there is not so much Scripture Read as in one day in the Establish'd Church.*

This he pretends to prove so fully that by his computation there appears to be Four times more Scripture Read in the Establish'd Church, then in all the Meetings of the North. To this purpose he pretends to take my own computation of half a Chapter Read in each Meeting for Three quarters of a Year, and so in the Nine Meetings in his Diocess he computes 175 Chapters and a half to be Read in a Year.

On the other hand, He computes 11 Psalms and 5 Chapters and so in all 16 Chap. Read in the 42 Parishes in his Diocess, and consequently in all 672 every Lords-day.

Adm. p. 142, 143. This Computation at first view looks like Demonstration, but is indeed liable to manifold and just Exceptions.

The Bp. here puts that sense on his words that was not the plain and obvious meaning of 'em. Their

Their obvious sense is; That there is as much Scriptura Read in every *Parish-Church* in one Lords day as in all the *Meetings* in the *North* in a Year; And there was good reason to suppose he intended 'em in this sense, both because 'tis but the *same* Chapters are Read in every *Parish Church* thro the Kingdom, and because without this sense, His Lp's. words left us wholly in the dark how to judge of the Truth of 'em, when he never told us, whether by the *Establish'd Church* he meant all the *Parish Churches* in the Kingdom or only those in the *North of Ireland*, nor gave us any Account what proportion the Number of the one or the other bore to the Number of the *Meetings*; without which particulars none cou'd judge whether his Assertion were true or false, or if true whether any matter of Reproach or no. For perhaps in the whole Kingdom the Number of Meetings is not much more to that of *Parish Churches* then that of one to 52. But

2. If we allow his Lp. the sense that he now puts on his Assertion, Yet his Computation will appear much too *Liberal* on his own side, and much more too *scanty* on the *Dissenters*.

His Computation is too *liberal* on his own side. For

1. He takes a day, viz. the first of April in his Computation on which there were several *Psalms* extraordinary us'd. For take the *Psalms* one with another, about 5 is the proportion of what is ordinarily us'd every Lords-day, and 'twas only casual that 11 were then us'd, the Eight first *Psalms* as well as the Three other being short and not above the proportion of 4 ordinary Chapters of 25 verses long.

2. He brings in 11 *Psalms* as Chapters Read for Instruction, (about which alone the present Dispute lies) whereas he himself supposes 'em to be us'd as Forms of Thanksgiving; And to do the *Common-Prayer-Book* in which these are not propos'd to be Read as Lessons, but sung or said between the Minister and People. So that by a just Computation there remains only the five Chapters a day.

And his Computation is as much too *scanty* on the *Dissenters* side; For tho I have drawn such a Computation as he mentions, yet I have drawn it only as a Computation of what is Read in an entire Portion, and indeed have drawn it much below the Truth; For there is more usually a whole Chapter read, and in the Meetings of his Diocels none but one, make any Exception of the Winter Quarter. But I was so far from designing this as a Computation of all that is Read, that I have in the very

words following those he Quotes told him, 'That I look Rem. p. 93: on his Charge to be so unjust that if we take the Scriptures to be Read whenever they are verbatim recited to the People, and so compute all the parallel Passages of Scripture that occur in their Expositions and Sermons, (in which both the N. C. Ministers in general and particularly those in the North use not to be sparing in their Concordances.) I see little reason to doubt but there is as much of Scripture read, or as much of the inspir'd word of God, propos'd for the Instruction of the People in each Meeting as in each *Parish Church*. And this way of Reading the Scripture I have shewn to be most agreeable to the Pattern and Practice of the Apostles and of the Christian Church in their Time.

Why then would the Bp. take no notice of this, which would have brought this debate to a more fair and easie Tryal. For what is Read this way among us will amount to vastly more, then what is Read in an entire Portion. For take one Lords-day with another, we may by a reasonable Computation allow between the portion Read, and the parallel Texts in the Exposition, a Chapter and half. And if we compute two Chapters more to each Sermon, there will be every Lords-day five Chapters and a half Read and I do not here mention what passages of scripture occur in Catechizing tho those will amount to a very considerable Portion if put together. And for the *Psalms* he has no more reason to bring them into the Computation then I have to bring in all the Scriptural Expressions that occur in our *Praises* and *Prayers*, which I have also shewn him are more agreeable to the *directions* of the *New Testament*.

But to Examine the Bp's. present Computation, If we allow him his 11 *Psalms* that are us'd as Forms of Thanksgiving, I hope he will allow us all that's strictly Read for *Instruction*. And that he may not scruple my Computation, I'll only allow one Chapter between the portion Read and the Exposition of it, I'll only compute 2 Chapters more for the 2 Sermons Preach't every Lords-day, and upon this Computation (which is really much less then is Read) it will appear, That in Nine Meetings, allowing a Chapter for the Lecture there is Read in the 3 Quarters of the Year 351; And allowing 2 Chapters each Lords-day in the Year for their Sermons there is Read 936 Chapters in a Year; Both these joynd make up 1287, Whereas in 42 *Parish Churches* the Bp. computes (with the 11 *Psalms* and all) only 672 Chapters, and if we shou'd add 42 Chapters more for their Sermon (For few Preach more then once a day) this will make 714, which is a little more then half of what is Read in those nine Meetings by the former Computation. But if this Computation were drawn to the utmost of Truth on the Dissenters side, (For since eight Meetings in his Diocess, Lecture throughout the whole Year, there are 104 Chapters to be added to the account, and as the Bp. reckons the *Psalms* we shou'd add all the scriptural passages that occur in our Thanksgivings) The Bp's account wou'd still appear the more wide from Truth. However upon the lowest Computation he is as really mistaken in this matter of Fact as he is apparently so in the foregoing, and has wrong'd em in the *circumstances* as well as *substance* of his Charge.

The 3d. matter of Fact which the Bp. undertakes to vindicate, is his Assertion, *That a Man may frequent the Meetings of the Dissenters all his Life and yet have no security or hardly possibility of Learning from their publick Teachings all the great Mysteries of his Religion.* Diss. p. 82.

This I have indeed censur'd as a *gross and shameless Accusation* and therefore was the more oblig'd to prove it so. To that purpose I not only told him, That the peculiar Mysteries of the Christian Religion were the ordinary subject of their Sermons, but that once a Year at least they constantly went through all the necessary Articles of the Christian Religion in their publick Catechizing, in which the Dissenting Ministers in the North were so particular as to Examine every particular Person of whose

whose knowledge there could be any occasion to doubt. And sure one would think if this be True, *Rom. p. 85, 86.* there can be no *Modesty* in such a hainous Accusation.

Let's then hear what the Bp. has offer'd to Vindicate himself,

1. He proposes a Summary of the Principles of our Christian Religion drawn rather from the Calendar than from the Apostles Creed, of which several Articles are omitted, because his Lp. cou'd find no Holy-days for 'em.

2. He tells us their Ministers have a certain time appointed every Year for Teaching each of these Mysteries.

3. That there lies no Obligation on the Dissenting Ministers, to go thro these Mysteries in any such time, nor in their whole Lives.

4. That he could not find upon Examination that their Ministers had done it.

5. He pretends that I endeavour to excuse this, by putting him to produce a Scriptural *See Ad. p. 145, 146, 147.* Command relating to it.

Now I wou'd desire him to review this, and tell us whether it signify anything to take off the plain Evidence I have produc'd, of the injustice of this Accusation, *viz. That their People are in Publick Teachings Yearly Catechiz'd, in which exercise all the Mysteries of the Christian Religion, and particularly those mention'd by his Lp. are explain'd to 'em: So that 'tis impossible they shou'd attend their Meetings one Year, but they have the opportunity of Learning 'em.* Is it not strange that the Bp. shou'd Overlook so clear a Demonstration against the Truth of his charge, under this Head, to which it properly dos belong? For if this be true there needs nothing more to prove what he has said to be so gross a Calumny as I have represented it. His Lp. has indeed thought fit to take notice of this in another place, *viz. p. 149.* where he dare not downright deny it, but wou'd gladly insinuate a strong suspicion against the Truth of it. His words are these. *I leave this matter of Fact with you and know what you must conclude, and hope you will be so just to your selves as to determine of whose credit this Author ought to be in his Relations. I will not derogate from your Ministers labours in Catechizing their People, but notwithstanding their pains, There are some Thousands of Men and Women in this Diocess that profess themselves of your Communion that were never Catechiz'd by 'em, &c.* Now either he means there are so many persons that were never Catechiz'd in those places where Ministers are settled, or in those where there are none. If he mean the latter, what's this to the purpose if it were true, as I do not find the Dissenting Ministers in his Diocess think it credible; If he mean the former, They do declare, They know of none that were never Catechiz'd where there are Ministers Settled, but all are ordinarily Examined once in the Year if not oftner. So that if any such remain ignorant 'tis not for want of their pains to instruct 'em. And since he leaves this matter of Fact with 'em to be determin'd upon the serious consideration, he may easily see how contrary their Judgment of it is to his, and if he will yeild to their Testimony concerning their own Practice, I hope he'll be convinc'd there is some credit due to my Relations, but none to his rash and mistaken Accusations.

But:

But besides that, the necessary Principles of Religion are Yearly explain'd in the *Catechism*, I have told him concerning the *Dissenters* in general, that tho they have no other *Rule* to direct 'em herein then that of the Holy Scriptures, yet they do in their Sermons most frequently insist on the particular Mysteries of the Christian Religion, and can appeal to their People as witnesses thereof. And that this is true concerning the Dissenting Ministers in his Diocess, he may find by Mr. *Cragheads* Account p. 75, 76. count in these words relating to the formention'd charge, 'I declare upon certain knowledge that what he has asserted is a most unjust Imputation for which he has reason to ask forgiveness of God; and I do appeal to many, Thousands now living who are ordinarily witnesses to the contrary, and many of the Author's persuasions on know the contrary. With what Peace of Conscience can any Man thus impose on strangers and impress future Generations with that which is so far from Truth! It being publicly known that we ordinarily and orderly go thro all the Heads of our Christian Faith in our publick Sermons. And what if this be not particularly prescrib'd by the Directory? Will it follow that tis not done? Or is not the Scripture a sufficient Directory for that purpose? And whereas the Bp. insinuates this suspicious Argument of our neglect, That he has seen many Sermons printed by our Party, and yet dos not remember above 2 or 3 on these most necessary Subjects (*viz.* the great Mysteries of our Religion) Is it not hence evident that he speaks at random of matters that he has little or no knowledge of? For I doubt not that instead of 2 or 3 there are above 2 or 3 hundred Sermons publish'd by N. C. Ministers on the principal Mysteries of the Christian Religion (including those that he has mention'd). What dos he think of the first Collection of Sermons in the Morning Exercise on the principal Heads of Christian Doctrine? Nay some Divines have Printed a large Body of Sermons on the particular Heads of the Assemblies Catechism; 176 of Mr. *Walston* are now extant, How many of those Mysteries are fully treated of in the large Volumes of Dr. *Mantons* and Mr. *Charnocks* Sermons? Not to mention Mr. *Baxter's*, Mr. *Ant. Burgess's*, Dr. *Bates's* and many more. So that if the Bp. have met with no more then 2 or 3 'tis only because he was never conversant in their Writings; But why then shou'd he throw about such severe Reproaches in the dark, and censure with such assurance what he is so entire a Stranger to, and what any that ever was in the least acquainted with their Writers, can shew him his ignorance and indiscretion in. And if the Conformists have Printed more, 'tis no wonder, when the Press has been more open to them, and they have had greater advantages for appearing in publick.

And is it not strange the Bp. shou'd pretend that I alledge what he quotes (p. 146, 147.) as an excuse in this matter, when I expressly disclaim the alledging it for that end, because we need no excuse, and only produce it as an argument *ad hominem*, which he was concerned to answer on the Principles he had laid down? So that upon the whole, the Bp. is oblig'd in all reason to do us right in this point, by owning so unhappy a mistake, and wiping off an Aspersion, which as 'tis manifestly untrue, so 'tis highly injurious

jurious to the reputation of his Brethren ; since if it were believ'd, no man that has any concern for his own Soul wou'd trust it to their Pastoral conduct who are so grossly negligent of so necessary a Duty.

The next matter of Fact is, The Bp. had affirm'd, *That not One in Ten of the Dissenters Children get their Catechism by heart.* Disc. p. 83. *nor One in Five hundred retain it.*

On the Contrary I suggested, *That I believ'd upon a more accurate Tryal, he wou'd find that as many of the Dissenters Children have got it by heart as of others that have done so by the Church Catechism.* Rem. p. 87.

To clear himself the Bp. here alledges. ' That he has besides grown ' People Confirm'd near a thousand Children, all above 13 years old, who ' cou'd say the Church Catechism ; and on the other hand he tells us of ' many Tryals he made in whole Schools at a Time, &c. among the Dissenters, and found that the generality cou'd not go ' above a leaf or two in it, and he doubts whether any Adm. p. 47, 48. ' at all after 20 retain it.

Now in Answer hereto, The Dissenting Ministers in his Diocese declare *That there are several Thousands of their People both old and young that can repeat the whole Catechism.* And how many there are in other Parishes may be in part computed from that of Temple-more in which there are 600 or more can repeat it. So that if his Lp. had so ill success in his Tryal, 'Tis to be imputed either to the dullness or the bashfulness of those he examin'd. For certainly their own Ministers shou'd know this matter better then he, and since he appeals to 'em, they declare *That they are assur'd he is mistaken in it.*

I come then to the 5th and principal matter of Fact disputed, viz. Concerning the frequency of Celebrating the Lords Supper.

As to this the Bp. had appeal'd to the Dissenters in general without any distinction, *Whether it were not a great thing among many of 'em, if once in a Year or 2 a Communion be celebrated in one of their Meetings, That among some 'tis often omitted for several Years together and in some places for Ten or more, and on this Account severely upbraids 'em with rare or no Communion as their peculiar Practice.* Disc. p. 161, 162.

In opposition to this Charge, I had told him *That for those Meetings in England and the South of Ireland where Pastors are settled, the most of 'em constantly celebrate the Lords-Supper once a Month, others once in six Weeks or two Months, and a few every Lords-day, &c.* From whence I infer'd the Injustice of this Accusation since the generality of the Dissenting Ministers celebrate this Ordinance much more frequently then the generality of the Parish Ministers, and their Communion are ordinarily more numerous as well as more frequent then those in the Parish-Churches, allowing for the proportion which the Number of the Dissenters bears to that of the Conformable Laity.

And now let us consider what the Bp. replies to this.

First he says, *he is not much concern'd in it, having address'd himself to those of his own Diocese.* Answer, Can his Lp. Admon. p. 155. with any reason pretend that he has asserted this only

concerning the Dissenters of his own Diocese, when he dos not only in the very entrance of his Book propote to examine the several parts of Worship as they are practis'd by *those that differ from the Establish'd Church*, or (as in the same p.) by *Protestant Dissenters* — See Disc p. 8. -- But gives this very Chapter the Title of, *The practice of Dissenters about frequency of Communicating*. But of this I have said enough already to shew him the unreasonableness of this Excuse.

Secondly, He insinuates these Arguments against the probability of it: 'If this be true, (saith he) their practice is much alter'd from what it was formerly: For when the Churches were in their hands, it was quite otherwise. St. Warburgh's, was a considerable Parish in the heart of Dublin, but had not the Lord's Supper administred in it for Twelve Years; and I have heard the like of some other Churches in Dublin at that time. I find the same observed concerning the whole University of Oxford from the Year 1648 to 1660. *Antiq. Oxon.* And he adds that he was told, 'That the Dissenters in Waterford did not Communicate above once a year before the Troubles if so often. *Admon. p. 155.*

Ans. For what was practis'd either in Dublin or Oxford in Oliver's time, I neither know or am concerned with. But for this Assertion of mine concerning the present practice of those Meetings of Dissenters in England and the South of Ireland in which Pastors are settled, I need no Vouchers at all. 'Tis a matter of Fact as easily known as our publick Assemblies are, and what we can produce as many Vouchers for as we have ordinary Hearers, there being always publick notice given of our Communion. And if the Bp. dispute this matter of Fact, he may next dispute whether our Senses may be trusted in what we dayly see and hear. For what he alleges concerning the practice of Dissenters in Waterford, of which he

saith he had opportunity to enquire, it will appear by the account given me by Mr. Sinclair, who was at that time their Minister: That either his Enquiry was very slight, or his Informers very ignorant of the matter, and that he has been as unhappily impos'd on by 'em as I shall now shew him he has been by those on whose credit he has related what is practis'd in his whole Diocese.

'Tis evident then he has extremely wrong'd the main Body of the Dissenters in this charge of their rare or no Communion.

But there are some things relating to the practice of the Dissenters in the North of Ireland which I have asserted, and which the Bp. dos very positively conclude me mistaken in.

I had told him from their Information, 'Tis so far from being true, that 'tis rare if once in a Year or two a Communion be celebrated in their Meetings; that 'tis universally usual in every Meeting where an Ordain'd Minister is settled, to have the Lord's Supper administred constantly once a year, and twice in the larger Towns. That when the Sacrament is administred in one Meeting, 'tis usual for most of the Members of neighbouring Parishes to frequent it. That the most serious People among 'em Communicate 4 or 5 times a year, and have the opportunity of doing 10 12 or 15 times if they will take the advantage.

“vantage of receiving it in Neighbouring Congregations, &c. And what I have here affirm’d is the very account sent me from the Reverend Mr. *Adair* of *Antrim*, with the approbation of that Meeting. And I shall here subjoin this following Observation he makes in his own words.

“ You know also that where the Sacrament is administred, two parts of the
 “ Receivers are usually Strangers; by which it is evident, that once ad-
 “ ministring according to the custom usual among Christians here, where
 “ they Communicate with each other in their several Congregations re-
 “ spectively, is equivalent to the administring of it 3 or 4 times a year
 “ to each particular Congregation, where this way is not in use.

Now as to this, the Bp. tells us, “ He has as good opportunity of in-
 “ forming himself in these matters as any can have, and has been as di-
 “ ligent in his Enquiries in his progresses thro his several Parishes, and on
 “ all occasions as he could, and he has the following account return’d him
 “ from many hands, and is satisfied there can be no great mistake in
 “ it.

“ In these last 7 years the Lord’s Supper has been celebrated among
 “ you, in *Derry* twice, in *Clondermot* once, in *Ballindret* once, at *Balli-*
 “ *kelly* once, at *Burt* twice, at *Ardstra* once, at *Abadowy* once, in all
 “ Nintetimes, (*Admon* p. 151, 152.) And p. 153 he adds a significant rea-
 “ son why he could not easily mistake in these matters, viz. “ Because their
 “ Sacraments are administred with such a concourse of Spectators and
 “ Hearers, that they can hardly escape Observation. (Tho by the way
 why the Bp. shou’d suppose this an Abuse brought in by Popery I do not
 understand; for I take it to be a very proper means of exciting in the
 Spectators pious desires of becoming Communicants. And for the practice
 of the Primitive Church in dismissing all that were not Communicants
 when they entred on the celebration of this Ordinance: I know of no
 other occasion for it, then their care to conceal these Mysteries of their
 Religion from the Pagans; a reason that we are not concern’d in.)

But now if after all this diligent Enquiry, the Bp’s Informers have grossly
 impos’d on him in almost every particular of this account, Nay if the
 account where it is true signify nothing to the purpose for which ’tis
 alledg’d, and appear highly disingenuous, then I hope he will think
 himself under some obligation to distrust those Informers for the future, and
 will be more cautious of asserting any thing on their credit to the reproach
 of his Brethren.

And here I wou’d premise, That there is an instance of disingenuity in
 the Bp’s method of comparing the practise of the Dissenters with that of
 the Establish’d Church, too obvious and palpable to be overlook’d. In his
 accounts how oft the Sacrament has been administred in the Establish’d
 Church he goes no farther back then the time of his own advancement to
 the See of *Derry* which was soon after the Troubles; But in his accounts
 how oft it has been administred by the Dissenters he takes in 7 years. tho
 he knows well enough that for 2 of the 7 at least both the Ministers & Peo-
 ple were scatter’d, and had no opportunity for Celebrating that Instituti-
 on. And yet he is so imprudent as to make this a great aggravation of their
 neglect; That some of those 7 years being times of afflictions requir’d a more frequent
 celebra

celebration of this comfortable Sacrament than ordinary. (See his *Errata* that refers to p. 27. l. 2.) As if he were ignorant that some of their Ministers were fled to Scotland, others shut up in the Walls of Derry, and their People so dispers'd that they cou'd not for a considerable time after the raising that Siege make up any distinct Congregations again. And if the Bp. alledg that at least the Dissenters in Derry during the Siege shou'd have had it Administred I wou'd desire him if he blame them on this account, yet to be so impartial as to give the *Conformists* there a share in his Reproof; For those I have desir'd to enquire upon the place cou'd not learn that they Administred it any more than the other. So that those 2 Years of public Troubles and Confusion ought in all reason to be shut out of his Account. And how unfortunate he has been in his particular and exact Account he now pretends to give, will appear by the following one that the Dissenting Ministers of his Diocess have after a very particular Enquiry given of the Years 87, 88. 91, 92, 93, 94.

‘ In the Years 87, 88. The Sacrament was administred in Derry twice, in Donaghadee twice, in Drumrah twice, in Ardara twice, in Urney twice, in Donaghmore twice, in Lifford once, in Glendermot once, in all 14 times.

‘ In the 4 last Years since the Troubles, the Sacrament was Administred.

‘ In Derry 4 times, in Bury thrice, in Abanomy twice, in Ardara twice, in Balindret or Lifford once, in Mahara once, in Balikelly once, in Donaghmore once, in Strabane once, In all Sixteen times. So that for the last 6 Years in which there can be any pretence for requiring the Administration of the Sacrament from 'em, it has instead of 9 times been Administred 30, Naytho we reckon the 2 Years of the Troubles in which they had no opportunity, yet the Year 88 falling within the compass of the Seven mention'd by the Bp. they had it 22 or 23 times.

But I have a more just and severe challenge against the Sincerity and Candour of this Account which the Bp's. Informers have given him, viz. That they were not so honest as to acquaint him, that besides the 2 Years of Troubles, in a great part of the other Years several of those Congregations had no Ministers at all, whom yet he makes accountable for the Sacrament during seven Years together. Whereas that Assertion of mine which the Bp. here undertakes to disprove concerns only such Congregations where Ministers are settled (For it were ridiculous to expect Sacraments where there are no Ministers to celebrate 'em). Now besides the 2 Years of 7 that are to be taken off from each Congregation. (For even Derry it self had no Ministers from the Year 88 till after the Troubles) the following Congregations had no Ministers for the Years hereafter mentioned.

‘ Glendermot or Clendermot had none at all since the Troubles, so that there has been a Minister there only one Year of the seven. Ardara had a Minister only 2 Years since the Troubles and in them 2 Sacraments, But had no Minister at all till after the Troubles. For Balindret 2 Communion were appointed, but both prevented by their Ministers being visited with Sickness and 'tis a Year since he Died, so that only one Sacrament

ment cou'd be celebrated since the Troubles. For Ballykelly, their Minister besides long Sicknes after the Siege of Derry, has been much in Scotland and elsewhere. For Strabane the Minister has not yet been 2 Years there, and the true reason why the Sacrament was but seldom Administered there before, was (besides the bodily infirmities of their Minister) chiefly the violence of persecution which forc'd him out of that Parish. And yet such blame the neglect whose unchristian severity was the cause of it. For the other places which the Bp. has overlookt in his Account and I have added in mine, I must also add, That Mahara had but one Sacrament since the Troubles, because they have had a Minister but one Year, And the same must be said of Donaghmore. For Donaghadee, Drumra and Urny, which had constant Yearly Communion before the Troubles, they have none of em had any Ministers since. Now by this Account it appears that according to what was practis'd where Ministers have been settled, there wou'd have been about 70 Communion celebrated, in the last 7 years in the 10 Meetings now mention'd, if either the want of Ministers in places, or their Sicknes, or the 2 years of Confusion and Troubles, or the like extraordinary Accidents had not prevented. So that for the Bp. not only to mistake nine times for about twenty three or thirty, but to charge these rare Communion on their negligence in Administering this Ordinance, when they were wholly owing to these extraordinary occasions foremention'd, is so highly disingenuous and unjust that he ought not to suffer those that have so unhappily abus'd him in these matters to pass without a severe Re-proof. For since the Dissenting Ministers in the North on the Account of the extraordinary pains they take to prepare their People for the Sacrament, celebrate it so seldom in each Congregation as once a year, there was the greater reason they shou'd not be wrong'd in the Accounts given of their Practice. So that in this matter of Fact, I hope the Bp. will own and retract his mistake.

For what I asserted concerning the Sacrament being twice a Year Administered in the larger Towns in the North was intended, and is true of Belfast, Carrickfergus and Antrim.

For what I have asserted concerning their Members Communicating 4 or 5 times a Year, it is true of the most devout and serious of em, and so is it, That they may have the opportunity of Communicating 10 or 12 or 15 times a year, within some miles of their respective Habitations.

This indeed the Bp. concludes to be a great mistake. Because on this supposition he thinks it will clearly follow, that not much above a hundred distinct Persons have Communicated in the Diocels, these last seven years. For 4 times 7 makes 28. And 300 (which his Lp. computes to be the full number of their Communicants in 7 years) divided by 28 gives about 128, but this can by no means be true. Therefore (saith the Bp.) he is certainly misinform'd in this Particular.

Admon. p. 153. *Ans.* The whole of this Computation depends on his 2 Suppositions, That the Sacrament has been Administered but 9 times in 7 years, and that one with another only 400 have Received at one time, and so 3600 in all. How great a mistake the former Supposition is, I have already shown, and how much

greater the latter is, will appear from this one passage, That in the *Parish of Templemore* alone (alias *Derry*) including the 2 Meetings of *Derry* and *Burt*, there have Communicated since the Troubles above 5000 which is above 1400 more then he supposes, to have Communicated in all the Dioceses in 7 years. Nay whereas he supposes That near as many have received in the Cathedral in 3 years past, as have Communicated with the Dissenters in his whole Dioceses in twice that time. It appears that near 2000 more of the Dissenters have Receiv'd in the same Parish, in about the same time, then have Receiv'd at the Cathedral, notwithstanding the Sacrament being Administred there every Month (tho by the way the Dissenters of *Derry* think he has stretcht the number of his monthly Communicants beyond all just bounds, of which they can give very shrewd evidence) Since then his Computation of the number of Communicants among the Dissenters is so vastly wide from Truth, his Inference from it falls of course.

For what I asserted concerning their having the opportunity of Communicating 10 or 12 or 15 times a year within some miles of their Respective Habitations, the Bp. concludes it to be a mistake because there being but nine Meetings in his Dioceses, tho each Member shou'd Communicate at each Meeting he cou'd but Communicate Nine times a Year, and must sometimes Travel Forty miles for a Sacrament. *Admon. p. 154, 155.*

Ans^r. I might here fully enquire, why the Bp. shou'd think the Dissenters of his Dioceses to be confin'd to it, that those that live near Meetings in another Dioceses may not take the opportunity of Communicating there. Does he think their Communion limited within the bounds of his Jurisdiction? But I must here acquaint him, that this Assertion of mine respects the generality of Meetings in the North, and therefore the Truth of it is to be estimated from those parts where the main Body of the Dissenters are to be found. Now he cannot be Ignorant that they are most numerous in the Counties of *Antrim* and *Down*. And therefore since he is pleas'd to arraign the Truth of the Assertion, I shall give him the following Demonstration of it, in reference to the Congregations that belong to the Meeting of *Antrim*, sent me by the Revd. Mr. W. Adair Minister of the Town of *Antrim*.

I take *Carrn-castle* which is the most remote Congregation save one Northward in our Meeting, and within 12 miles they may Communicate, at *Glenties*, *Brade*, *Ballymacloch*, *Coyner*, *Ballyrasheen*, *Ballyclare*, *Carmoney*, *Dunagor*, *Ebry*, *I. Malger*, *Broad-Island*, *Carickfergus* twice, *Temple Patrick*, and *Carrn-castle* itself 15 times.

I take *Belfast*, which is the farthest of our Meeting Southward, and I suppose within 12 miles they may yearly Communicate above twenty times, viz. At *Belfast* twice, at *Quilickfergus* twice, *Antrim* twice, *Holywood*, *Kewick*, *Kirk-donald*, *Newton*, *Cumber*, *Killinchy*, *Donaghadee*, *Tonnochnear*, *Danmully*, *Lisbon*, *Annabilt*, *Dunagor*, *Carmoney*, *Temple Patrick*, *Ballyclare*, *Ballyrasheen*, *Dunagor*, upper *Killade*, lower *Killade*, *Broad-Island*, (which is within 11 miles), In all 26 times.

You may easily conceive that many places or almost all in our Meeting

ing which are towards the centre can have the Sacrament as often at least, and generally oftner then at *Carr-castle*.

So that this matter of Fact is true beyond all Exception as I have asserted it, concerning the generality of their Meetings. And I am no way oblig'd to prove it concerning every Particular one in the remotest parts of the Province of *Ulster*.

Again, whereas the Bp. had affirm'd in his Discourse, ' That he cou'd not compute, that one in Ten that go to their Meetings ever Receive thro the whole course of their Lives, and blames me for asserting the contrary. That there is not one in Ten, but do Communicate except such as are with-held for want of competent knowledge, or on the account of scandal, (or I might here add thro their own scruples about their preparation for it) as if this were a great Reflection upon

'em. as if 19 in 20 were ignorant or scandalous. This *Admon. p. 154.* will appear to be a very mistaken Account of this matter

if we compare the Number of *Hearers* in the 2 Meetings of *Derry* and *Bux*, with the Number of *Communicants*. For their ordinary *Hearers* are about 2400. (Of which some part are suppos'd to be left at Home every Lords day) And yet in some of the Communion there since the Troubles, there have Communicated 984 Persons, in one of those Meetings. So that we may compute about 1600 *Communicants* in both. Now tho we allow a considerable deduction out of this number of *Communicants*, for the Strangers that may be suppos'd to have receiv'd, yet the number of *Communicants* belonging to those 2 Congregations compar'd with that part of their *Hearers* that are of Age to Receive, will sufficiently demonstrate that the Bp's Computation *that not one in Ten Receive*, must be very wide from Truth.

For the generality of the *Dissenting Ministers* Administring this Sacrament far oftner then the generality of the *Conforming Clergy*, I did not, as the Bp. here groundlessly supposes, assert it concerning *Admon. p. 151* the *Dissenting Ministers* in the North of Ireland, but of those in England and the South of Ireland, (which make up the generality of 'em) concerning whom tis too apparently true to admit of being disputed.

And for their pressing their People as much or more to it; if we may judg thereof by the success of their Exhortations, I think it past doubt, that take an equal number of Meetings and *Parish Churches*, and according to the proportion of *Hearers* in the one and the other. the *Communicants* are far more Numerous in the Meetings then the *Parish churches*, even tho the former are far more strict in their Admissions, and in the latter few are ever refus'd that desire to come. Of which if the Bp. please I shall produce him manifold instances. And for what his Lp. affirms of their Sermons tending rather to deter poor weak Creatures from Receiving then encourage 'em, by magnifying the difficulty and danger of the undertaking, I know no ground he has for this Assertion unless it be, That they endeavour to deter all that are grossly ignorant or scandalous from profaning that Holy Institution. and dare not encourage any to approach to it, but such as in some measure understand the nature of it, and do not by

a scandalous Life contradict those solemn Vows of Obedience which they there come to renew upon the memorials of a Crucified Saviour.

As for this last matter of Fact in reference to this Head about a *reputed Elder*, (or as in his *Errata* he corrects it) *Professor of 30 or 40 Years of Age that never Receiv'd but Disputes against it*, Admon. p. 158. If the Bp. had pleas'd to name him, the Truth of what he asserts might have been examin'd. But till we know who he is, we must let this matter lie undecided unless we dispute in the Dark.

So that in the whole of this Debate which relates to the Sacrament, the mistake lies on the Bp's side even in reference to the North of Ireland, tho he was oblig'd to make his charge in his Discourse good concerning the *Dissenters in general*, without any such limitation.

For the Bp's being offended at my saying, *That too many profligate sinners are admitted to the Communion in the Parish Churches, and his charging me on that account with being uncharitable and unjust, and challenging me to instance in some in his Diocese.* Admon. p. 156. I shall only reply,

That I never yet met with any person before his Lp. that doubted this matter of Fact, and would not rather lament than dispute it. For 'tis no more than has been frequently own'd by the best of their own Writers, and imputed to the present corruption or weakness of their discipline. And tho for naming particular instances I must beg the Bp's pardon, yet I will alledge what is equivalent to it. Does his Lp. think there are no profligate sinners in Military and Civil Employments in England? and yet the Sacrament-Test obliges 'em all to receive the Sacrament, and he knows they are not scrupled when they come. Nay, were not the common Soldiers since the Restoration in Dublin forc'd to receive, and driven to it by their Officers with Oaths and Curses, when nothing but the consciousness of their own wickedness deterr'd 'em? But as to this matter, I shall freely appeal to the common judgment of all sober Persons of his own Party, and fear not their Censure on this score; it being rather to be wish't for the honour of the Reformed Religion that the evidence of this Truth were less notorious. Nay to the judgment of the same persons I would refer it, what ground there is for that Observation which the Bp. tells us some have made, *That Enmity to the Establish'd Religion and Immoralities are gotten on one side in too many instances, if it be meant of the Dissenters.* For besides that, the Dissenters have no Enmity at all to the Establish'd Religion, having Subscrib'd in England all the *Doctrinal Articles* of it. That the Members of their Communion compar'd with those of the Establish'd Church, are more generally guilty of Immoralities, is an Observation that I suppose will hardly pass current with any but such as have a faith to believe whatever their Interest or their Affection to a party dictates to 'em.

And since in reference to these matters of Fact his Lp. requires me to produce my *Vouchers*, and charges me as writing upon none, or very partial Information, I shall so far comply with his Demand, as to produce the following Testimonial, of the Truth of what I have said, in reference to the practice of the Dissenters in his Diocese, about whom our present Debate lyes,

lyes, from these three undernamed Ministers in his Diocess, who have diligently examined these matters of fact, and whose Informations communicated to me relating to 'em were together with these Papers review'd and approv'd by the whole Presbytery.

WE the under subscribers having perus'd these Papers of the Reverend Mr. Joseph Boyse, drawn up in Answer to that part of the Bp. of Derry's Admonition which concerns the practice of the Protestant Dissenters in this Diocess of Derry, do declare, Those Informations which we have given him relating to it, and to which he here refers, to be true; and hereby attest 'em as such to the World, in order to our just Vindication from the misrepresentation made of those matters of Fact by the Bishop of Derry.

Robert Craghead, Minister of Derry.

Andr. Ferguson, Minister of Burt.

Will. Homes, Minister of Strabane.

And for his Lp's farther satisfaction, Whereas one of the most remarkable differences between his account and theirs relates to the frequency of Celebrating the Lord's Supper (his account supposing them guilty of very scandalous negligence) the Reverend Mr. Craghead has now in his hands, and is ready to produce whenever his Lp. desires it, particular Testimonials of this account now given under the Hands of the Elders, and other Communicants of each Meeting. Nay, since the difference is most remarkable in reference to Derry it self, which he affirms has had the Sacrament but twice the 7 Years, whereas they assert it has been administered 5 times, (tho for 2 of the 7 Years they had no Minister of their own) and since the Bp's Friends pretend to undeniable Evidence for the truth of this matter of fact, I shall, (to shame, if possible, his Informers out of their Confidence) trouble the Reader with the following Certificate, as a Specimen of what shall be produc'd, if required, from the other Congregations.

WE the undernamed Subscribers having heard, and read of several things charged on the People of the Presbyterian persuasion of this City and Suburbs, now under the Pastoral charge and care of the Reverend Mr. Robert Craghead, and formerly of the Reverend Mr. Robert Rule, for the ho-

G

nouring

nouring the great God who is a God of Truth; and in opposition to all those that have endeavour'd to possess the minds of such as are Strangers to us. by speaking or writing contrary to Truth; We do hereby certifie and give under our Hands, and are ready to make it farther appear, if need be, upon Oath, that from the time of our being under the charge and care of Mr. Robert Rule, as our Pastor, which commenc'd about the year 1672, till the time of his being necessarily call'd to go for Scotland, which was A. D. 1688, we had the Sacrament of the Lords-Supper duly Administred by him once a year in his Congregation; excepting those wherein we were violently hindred by the severity of Persecution. And more particularly that the Revd. Mr. Robert Rule Administred that solemn Ordinance of the Lords-supper to us in this place, in May 1687, and in April 1688, soon after which we were desolate of any fixed Minister till it pleased the Lord, our now Revd. Pastor, Mr. Craghead was fix't among us in the year 1690; and he has since then Administred this Sacrament in this Congregation the 12th day of July 1691, On the 24th of July 1692, On the 14th day of May 1693, And on the 22d day of July 1694. The Cause of our knowledg hereof is, that we were Members of this Congregation, and did then partake of that Ordinance. And we desire this may be compar'd with what is asserted in a Book Entitled, An Admonition to the Dissenting Inhabitants of the Diocess of Derry, &c. p. 153. In Testimony of the Truth whereof we have bereunto set our Hands at Londonderry the 25th of September, 1694.

Henry Long, Mayor.

Alexander Lecky, Mayor Elect,

James Wilton, James Lenox, Alexander Gordon.

Hugh Dayey, Horas Kennedy, John Cowan.

Hugh Eadie, Robert Harvey, Will. Mackie.

Edward Brooks, Andrew Garven, John Harvey.

And

And sure if the Bp's Enquiries be so strangely unsuccessful in the very place where he resides, we may justly infer how little regard is due to those he made in other places. And upon the whole the unbiass'd Reader may judg, what ground his Lp. had to say in reference to all these matters of Fact. That concerning the Truth of what he had said, he need do no more then appeal to the Consciences of Dissenters; And that he must tell us that what he wrote was from Sight, Experience, or certain Information; whereas he saith, I had my Account of things only at second hand; and produce no Vouchers. Admon. p. 142. If he will stand to their Judgment to whole Consciences he has appeal'd he may easily foresee his doom. For their Sight and Experience are quite contrary to his. And since he obliges me to produce Vouchers for what I have said, I hope he'll either yield this point or produce as credible ones as these.

But before I dismiss this Head, it will be requisite to take some notice of those Remarkable words wherewith the Bp. closes it, To conclude (saith he) It were as easie to show, That Mr. B. is mistaken in every matter of Fact wherein he has charg'd me with falshood as in these; But the design'd shortness of this Admonition will not give me leave to pursue 'em, &c. I answer. I hope the Bp. will at length be convinc'd, that instead of vindicating his former mistakes he has only run into new ones which are somewhat the less excusable, because he had so much time and leisure as well as advice to correct 'em. And since most of them are very injurious to the good Name of his Brethren, common Justice shou'd have oblig'd him instead of Reprinting to have Rectified 'em. But as he has had so little success in his endeavours to clear himself in the foregoing Particulars, so I something wonder that he shou'd with all this assurance pretend that I have in all the other Instances groundlessly charg'd him with falshood or mistakes. What! will his Lp. still go about to persuade us, That we have no other way of praying God but by singing a verse or 2 Disc. p. 24. of a Psalm? Or that the first Principle he ascribes to us about Prayer is asserted in the Directory (when he himself tacitly corrects the mistake in this 2d Edition of his Discourse? Or that he has truly represented the Judgment and Sense of the General Assembly in Scotland in their Directions concerning Family worship? p. 44 45. Will he still persuade us, That a considerable Body of Dissenters Teach all Forms of Prayer to be unlawful, and affirm it sinful to join where any are us? p. 57. Or, that on the account of this Principle the pious Custom of Training up young People to a constant course of Devotion in their Morning and Evening Secret Prayer is too universally laid aside among the Dissenters; concerning the Truth, whereof he confidently appeals to all of 'em? p. 64. Will he still affirm, That the Directory excludes all Bodily Worship? p. 128. Or, That the Dissenters in General do not stand up at their Thanksgivings, and generally sit at their publick Prayers? p. 129. And that they have not one visible Act of Adoration in their Assemblies, except the Men uncovering their heads in Prayer? p. 130. Nay will he still persist in it, That the Dissenters are taught that external postures of Bodily worship may in no case be Pleas'd? p. 137. That the Directory do not allow the People to signify their Consent by saying Amen to their publick Thanksgivings? p. 138. That as to Gestures, such as Kneelings, Standing, bowing the Head, the Dissenters condemn 'em all as Re-
licks.

checks of Idolatry and Superstition? That by turning all Bodily-worship out of their Assemblies? They are mere Spectators, not Joynt-worshippers? p. 138, 139. Or, That neglecting to kneel at the Sacrament has harden'd them against all Reverence in other parts of Worship? p. 144. And to add no more, Will he still justify all as true concerning the Dissenters in General, which he has affirm'd of 'em, without any distinction in reference to the Lords-Supper? p. 161, 162. Will the Bp. still think to persuade us that in all these matters of Fact, he has justly accus'd us, and we have no reason to complain of being Misrepresented and Abused? Or does he think his bare word sufficient to bear down the Reputation of so considerable a Body of Protestants? Or would he have us silently bear the odium of so many grievous Reflections cast upon us, which we are as sure of the injustice of, as we are that we know our own Opinions or Practices. His Lp. must therefore give us leave to be free with him on this occasion, and to demand once more, That he either in the good, his charge against us in these Particulars, or honestly confess his being mistaken or misinform'd about 'em. Which if he would once do, he will find us very ready not only to forgive the wrong done us, but to entertain more favourable thoughts of his veracity and charity than 'tis almost possible for us to do, while these mistakes in his Book and in his Admonition stand uncorrected.

There are but Two things more which I think my self oblig'd to take notice of, before I come to consider the Exceptions he produces against some particular passages in the Remarks. The first is, That the Bp. tells me, I have nothing to do with him, and the Dissenters of his Diocese, and blames me for interposing myself without any Call or Reason as well as writing upon little or no Information. Admon. p. 138.

To which I shall only offer a few Things in my own Defence.

I. I have already had occasion to show, That the Bp's Discourse was in all just construction level'd against the Dissenters in General. Nay he usually falls upon the Directory, which is a Book the generality of Dissenters have a great and just value for, (the Compilers of it having us'd great modesty and tenderness in it's Composition, without following the imposing temper of those that requir'd so peremptory a Declaration of Assent and Consent to all things contain'd in and prescrib'd by the Book of Common Prayer, and the Form of Ordaining Bishops, Priests and Deacons). So that since his Discourse is directed against what himself supposes to be the common Opinions and Practices of Dissenters, every Man among 'em had a just right to defend the common cause and the Bp. has no just ground to complain of any ones interposing in it.

ONay I had a very just Call to it; And that from the Dissenting Ministers of his own Diocese, who urg'd this reason for it, That as the Bp's Discourse might possibly offend those that were strangers to the Dissenters with ill apprehensions of 'em, if his mistakes were not discover'd; so few would read an Answer to it, if it came not out while the matter was fresh in their minds; And they had less of leisure for such an undertaking at that time. And as I did not interpose without their desire, so neither did I write without

out particular Informations from 'em, to which I have exactly adher'd; and from which I have yet seen no reason to recede.

3. I had yet a more particular concern in the Bp's Book; for tho' he would not vouchsafe an Answer to some former Papers of mine (showing the unreasonableness of his excluding us from the Catholick Church) yet he took the liberty to misrepresent the Principles laid down in 'em, and charg'd 'em as inconsistent with the Unity and Peace of the Church. So that I lay under a particular obligation to vindicate my self, as well as under a common one to justify the common Opinions and Practices of Dissenters, which the Bp. had either misrepresented or argued against upon weak and insufficient grounds.

The second the Bp. complains of, is That I give him hard words, and speak hard things of him. Admon. p. 141, 142, 145, &c.

Ans. I may I think in this matter appeal to any equal Judges of things, Whether the Dissenters have not just reason to complain of him, for saying to many hard & reproachful things of them without any just ground, then he to complain of me, only for telling him how greatly he has wrong'd us, and how little regard he has had to Truth in such a multitude of particulars wherein he has injur'd or abus'd us. And indeed some of those Accusations tended so apparently to do him indirect injury, that it would have look'd like a tacit confession of Guilt, to have express'd no dissent at such dissingenuous Treatment. Nor do I understand that the Bp. had any great reason to expect the same defence to be paid to him, that would have been due to any other of his character, that had given any evidence of his moderation and charity. It is true indeed both his Discourse and Admonitions (bating the many severe, but groundless aspersions in 'em) have an air of mildness and temper in the style of 'em; and we often meet with friendly appellations in 'em. But I take mens declared Opinions, and especially their Actions, to be a surer Indication of their Temper than the common Civilities that occur in their way of writing. I had very obliging language towards *Amasa* in his mouth, *Art thou in heatish my Brother?* but he carried a sharp Toal in his hand, and he had no friendly design. We can lay little stress on any seeming expressions of a mans charity, who will not recall that verbal sentence of *Damnation* he has publicly pass'd upon us, by denying us to be a part of the Catholick Church. We like not the gentle language of *Writers de Excom. Cap.* And we can perceive no extraordinary mildness and friendship in such Covenants inserted in *Leases* as the following one [“And the said *A. B.* his Executors, &c. goes by these presents Covenanted and with the said *William D.* Bp. of *Down* & his Successors, &c. for the time being, that neither he the said *A. B.* his Executors, &c. nor any of 'em &c. shall or will Sell, Let, or Demise the Premises, or any part thereof, to any Mass or Popish Priest &c. or to any Minister or Teacher dissenting from the Church of *Ireland*. Neither shall wittingly or willingly suffer 'em to dwell or reside on any party parcel or member thereof, but him or them shall endeavour to expel and keep from the same so far as by the Laws of this Realm they shall be enabled.”] So that if the Pp. have been reprov'd somewhat sharply for his unfair dealing in this new Dispute, he has but

furnish'd us with too just an Apology for it. And yet I know of no words given him so hard (how deserved soever), as those he has given the whole Body of Dissenters which have been wholly undeserved. And I am sure he will not find in the *Remarks* any such uncharitable sentiments express'd concerning the *Establish'd Church*, as occur frequently in his *Discourse* concerning the *Dissenters*. And for what Touches himself only, he seems to have little reason of complaint, unless he can clear himself a little better in matters of Fact than he has done in this *Admonition*.

I come now to consider the Bp's few *Exceptions* against the *Argumentative* part of the *Remarks*.

In his Entrance on which he alledges That 'tis the design of the *Remarks* to hinder the *Dissenters* from joining with the *Establish'd Church* *Admon. p. 159.* in their ordinary *Lords-day-Worship*; Now I know no reason why his *Lp.* should pretend that to be my design which I no where propos'd as such; For all I profess't to attempt was, the *Vindication* of our own *Worship* from this weak charge of human *Inventions* and the *restoring* his *Arguments*, where they were stronger against the *Worship* of the *Establish'd Church* than against ours. But if the Bp. here speak of occasional *Communion* with the *Establish'd Church* in her ordinary *Lords-day-Worship*, 'Tis strange that he should suppose it my design to hinder the *Dissenters* from it, when I expressly declare my own opinion for the lawfulness of it, *Remark p. 146.* and urg'd him to express the same charity towards us, which I perceive he cannot be so easily persuaded to.

He farther premises, That it was incumbent on one that Answer'd his Book to justify our way of *Worship* by shewing that the manner of performing it in the several parts of it, as distinguish'd from theirs, is warranted by *Scripture-Precept* or *Precedent*, or by direct consequence from thence, &c. But (he saith) instead of undertaking this Task, Mr. B. argues against and condemns the Rule, whereas as strict as it appears, He has justin'd all the particular ways of *Worship* in the *Establish'd Church* by it, and if I could have done the same for ours, I need not have declin'd it. *Admon. p. 159, 160.*

If his *Lp.* had Answered the *Remarks* he wou'd have had perhaps some pretence to have said this. But he has none now, when he himself is forc't (as I shall shew) to alter his own Rule, When I had so largely prov'd that our *Worship* in most particular parts of it was more agreeable to *Scripture-precept* or *Example* than theirs; and also shew'd him that his Rule as laid down by himself wou'd condemn all Churches in the World in which there were some circumstantial modes, and those very lawful, that neither express *Scriptural Precept* nor *Pattern* cou'd be produc't for, nor indeed cou'd reasonably be expected. And therefore since the Bp. lays so great stress on this matter, I shall carefully examine the Three Heads he suggests in reference to it.

1. He saith, I give another Rule for the ordering *God's Services*.

2. He saith, I endeavour to persuade the *Dissenters* that the greatest *Exception* they have against joining with the *Establish'd Church* is not matter of *Worship*.

3. He

3. He saith, I alledge what he has omitted to handle that part of Worship against which the Dissenters have the greatest Exception and that because he can not defend it.

1. He saith, I give another Rule for the ordering God's Service. And to that purpose he thus pretends to cite my own Expressions, *And to his new Rule of Worship you will find it in p. 7. in the 9 words, Modes and Circumstances of Divine Worship, &c. tho' necessary in general by Divine Precept, yet are left in particular to be determin'd by Human Prudence.* For tho' God has Commanded Publick Prayer, &c. yet what time or place we shall assemble in, In what order these parts of worship shall be perform'd, &c. are left to Human Determination, only therein the general Rules of Scripture must be regarded. *From whence his Lp. concludes, That 'tis my Rule or Principle, That all Modes of Worship whatever are left to Human Prudence, and particularly the determination of Time, Place, Order, Circumstances, Postures, and Utensils in all cases.* Against which he Argues, That God has not only given us general Rules to praise Him, pray to Him, hear his Word, &c. but He has likewise given us many particular Rules and Examples concerning each of these, to which if we diligently attend and mind the consequences of 'em and apply 'em to the like cases, we may have sufficient Directions from Scripture to order our Worship without having recourse to Human Prudence.

Ans. If the Bp. please to review the Remarks he will find that he has plainly mistaken and misrepresented what they assert in reference to this matter, that he might have some pretence to find fault with it. For in the place he cites I am laying down no Rule at all; but only mentioning an improper sense of Human Inventions, as the Reader wou'd have evidently perceived if the Bp. had not by misciting my words maim'd 'em and perverted the plain sense of 'em, For they run thus in the Remarks, p. 7. It remains only that I subjoyn in order to the clearing the state of this Controversy, That there is a very improper sense, in which this phrase of Human Inventions in the Worship of God may possibly be used, viz. To signify such Modes and Circumstances of divine Worship as tho' necessary in general by divine Precept, yet are left in particular to be determined by Human Prudence, &c. Of which kind of Circumstantial Modes, I there produce several instances relating to Time, Place, Orders, Utensils, &c. and wou'd gladly know whether his Lp. can produce any particular Determination of 'em in Scripture for every particular *Chap. b. viii.* What time of the Lords day their publick Worship shall begin, what place they shall assemble in, What Translation of the Bible they shall use, whether they shall begin with Prayer or Praise, or what Vessels they shall use in the celebration of the Sacraments. But I do by no means suppose, That God has given no particular Directions at all in reference to the Modes of Worship but the quite contrary. For 'tis one Instance I produce of Human Inventions, p. 55. That whereas every part of Worship enjoy'd by God as Prayer, Praise, &c. is capable of being perform'd in various circumstantial Modes, If the Law of God expressly enjoyn us any particular Mode, Then to devise another of our own, exclusive of that which

which he has chosen and determin'd, is to bring in a sinful Human In-
 vention into his Worship. As Instance there in Prayers in an unknown
 Tongue, Communicating without the Cup, solitary Communions, &c.
 Such Modes then as God has determin'd by the particular Directions of
 his Word, I plainly exclude from the Determination of Human Prudence.
 Nay so far am I from supposing that Human Prudence may arbitrarily
 appoint any Modes of Worship that Men think fit, that I rank among sin-
 ful Inventions; p. 6. All such Rites and Ceremonies of Mens own de-
 vising as are no way warranted by any general Rules of Scripture, and
 yet made stated Appendages of any part of divine Worship and terms of
 Communion in it. All therefore that I assert is, That all those circum-
 stantial Modes of Worship that are in general necessary by divine precept
 (because God's own Commands about His Worship cannot be executed
 without the determination of 'em) and yet are not in particular deter-
 min'd in Scripture, must be determin'd by Human Prudence; and that to
 call such circumstantial Modes when determin'd agreeably to the general
 Rules of Scripture, *Human Inventions* is a very improper sense of the word,
 and to make 'em sinful, is a principle fit only for the wildest Sectaries, since it
 would condemn a great many prudential orders practis'd both by them and
 us, and indeed by all Churches in the World. And if the Bp. pretend to dis-
 prove this assertion, he must produce us particular Precept or Pattern from
 Scripture, for his beginning publick Worship at nine or ten in the Fore-
 noon rather than twelve, for his Meeting at the Cathedral rather than in
 another place; For his using the old Translation of the Psalms, and the new
 one of the rest of the Bible, for his using at the Sacrament *Unleaven'd* rather than
Leaven'd Bread, and using one sort of Wine rather than another, and employing Pew-
 ter or Silver vessels rather than Wooden or Golden ones. So that what
 I assert is not only very innocent and free from any such dangerous conse-
 quences as the Bp. suggests, but indeed too obvious and plain for any Man
 of sense to doubt of it, and his Bp. cou'd never have begun any new Dis-
 tinction about it, if he had not rais'd a mist by misunderstanding the sense of
 our clear Expressions as could well be us'd on this Subject. Since then he
 has so plainly mistaken in ascribing such a Run to me as I no where laid
 down, but have so fully affirm'd, all the consequences he draws from it,
 either to his own advantage or our Prejudice fall of course, and I am no way
 concern'd in 'em as consequences drawn from any Opinion of mine;
 For tho' plain the Rules lay'd down in the Remarks do not justify all the
 Modes of Worship practis'd in the Establish'd Church. Neither that way
 of singing the Psalms that excludes the generality of the People for
 the Cathedral Musick; nor the confining all publick Prayers to fix'd
 Forms; nor Reading the Apocrypha, nor bowing towards the East or
 Altar, or at the name of Jesus, nor Reading one part of the Prayers where
 many of the People cannot hear 'em; nor the use of the Cross, or our scrt
 of Sponsors in Baptism, nor so much as Kneeling in the Act of Receiv-
 ing. All these and many more particular Modes are not defensible by any
 Rule I have laid down, tho' I have shewn him that our own Practices
 yet so many as I have laid down will defend all sort of Holydays,
 nor

nor any Determinations relating to Habits, Place or Utensils that are contrary to Edification, or to Order and Decency.

But whereas the Bp. pretends, That in those particular Rules and Directions he had produc't from Scripture relating to the several parts of Worship, ' The Letter of Scripture ' is clearly on his side, and I have not oppos'd Scripture to Scripture, but ' have declin'd the literal sense in many cases without reason, and have ' preferr'd the determinations of Human Prudence in others, as being ' more for Edification then the Scripture-Examples, and particularly in the ' singing of Psalms. I must needs on this occasion acquaint him, that I think the quite contrary to what he Asserts will appear to any that impartially compare the *Remarks* and his *Discourse* together, at least I hope his Lp. does not expect we shou'd take his peremptory Assertion for a proof of it; But since he supposes this Observation to be manifest in reference to that particular Mode of Praying God by *singing of Psalms*, I shou'd add, that I think it not so ingenuous in the Bp. to Assert this with such assurance, when I have in the *Remarks* taken such particular pains to shew, That our way of singing Psalms is most conformable to the only Precept in Scripture, that relates to the use of 'em in our Praises, 5 *Eph.* 19. 3 *Col.* 16. to which he has yet vouchsaf't no Answer. He has been told, ' That the Precept enjoyns vocal singing, which bare saying 'em no way ' Answers, p. 13, 14. That since the Psalms of David were wrote in ' such sort of Metre and Verse as was then us'd, and since the knowledge ' of their musical Tunes and Instruments is quite lost, to suppose us oblig'd to an exact imitation of 'em, were to suppose us oblig'd to impossibilities. That therefore the Command which obliges Christian Churches to sing Psalms, necessarily obliges us to turn 'em into such sort of Metre and Verse, as will best accommodate 'em to be sung by the People. Whereas to put 'em into no other Metre then the pointed Psalter in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, is to exclude the generality of the People from any capacity of complying with God's own Command for singing 'em. And as the Tunes of those pointed Psalms are quite different from Hebrew ones, so they are as much a Human Invention as the Tunes of the *Common-Metre-versions*, and therefore to set up that pointed Psalter in the *Sardice-Book*, whose Tunes the body of the People cannot follow to the Exclusion of those Metre-versions according to which they can joyn in singing Psalms, (as the Bp. seems to design) is in his language to set up an Human Invention to the violation of a divine Command, by rendering the People's observance of it impracticable, p. 189, 190. And shou'd not his Lp. in all equity and reason have attempted a clear refutation of this Argument before he had ventur'd to say, That in this particular of singing Psalms, The Scripture is on his side, and that I prefer the determinations of Human Prudence before Scripture Examples, when I have so plainly shewn him, That the Example or Pattern of Jewish singing is unimitable by us, because unknown to us, but that the Precepts of Scripture plainly obliges us to this way of singing, because 'tis most generally practicable among us. To what purpose is it to reason in these matters, if the Bp. think his bare affirmation sufficient to weigh down all Arguments? And why dos he call this *Admon.* p. 164.

Our manner of singing Psalms, when 'tis theirs as well as ours, and tho he has ventur'd to exclude it from being any substantial part of their Worship, and made it a meer Diversion, yet he has done it without any Authority or Commission from the Establish'd Church, by whom it seems allow'd as a stated part of Worship.

And as the Bp. has ascrib'd to me a Rule about Worship that I never laid down, so he stiffly pretends to adhere to his own, when yet what I had alledg'd against it, as unhappily worded by himself, has so far convinc'd him, that he found himself necessitated to enlarge it. He had

Disc. p. 3. before said, *That all ways of Worship are displeasing to God that are not expressly contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, or warrant'd by Examples of Holy Men mention'd therein.* He had us'd the phrase *ways of Worship* frequently to signify circumstantial Modes of it. I had told him,

That if his words be taken in this strict sense, they contain such an Assertion that if a Man believ'd it, he wou'd find it hard to joyn in any Assembly in the Christian world, and must renounce Communion with the Parish Churches. (For many circumstantial Modes of worship are practis'd there, which are neither expressly contain'd in the Scriptures, nor warrant'd by any Examples of Holy Men that have us'd those particular circumstantial Modes, *ex. gr.* The singing Psalms as pointed in the Common-prayer-book, or in the Metre compos'd by Sternhold and Hopkins, the use of a stinted Liturgy in general, and particularly our English one; Reading the Apocrypha, bowing at the name of Jesus, kneeling at the Sacrament, &c.) But his Lp. instead of taking any notice of this objection against his Rule, very silently now extends it, only to make

Adm. p. 165. *those things unlawful that are not contain'd in Scripture, or warrant'd by Example of Holy Men in it, or may not be deduc'd by clear consequence, or parity of Reason from them.* Now 'tis evident that many things may be drawn by clear consequence and parity of reason from the Precepts of Scripture that are not expressly contain'd in em. And the same may be said of Scripture Examples. So that the Bp. has now really charg'd his Rule by this new comprehensive Addition to it, and as 'tis now layd down, 'tis much the same with what I have assert'd, tho I think not so clear. And now he will find,

there's nothing in our worship but what is easily justifiable by his own Rule in this just latitude; For our manner of singing it self, (which is the Instance he so often insists on) may be drawn by just consequence and by parity of reason both from the Precepts and Examples of singing in the Holy Scriptures. For if we must sing Psalms, and that in a way most conducive to general Edification, we must use such Metre and Tunes as the People can joyn in; And if the Jews us'd such sort of Metre and Tunes as were most known and common among them, we may by parity of reason choose those that are most familiar to us. And now I hope the Bp. will upon the review see how little reason he had to except against this part of the Remarks, when they have really oblig'd him to reform and correct his own Rule, and bring it up to that I had layd down, tho to conceal the matter, he has thought fit to misunderstand and pervert mine, or rather to coyn a new one for me.

The Bp. alleges, That I endeavour to persuade the Dissenters of his Diocese, That the greatest Exception against joining with the Establish'd Church, is not the matter of their Publick ordinary worship. On which he makes several Observations.

Before I consider 'em, I must premise that 'tis true I have told his Lp. that the Contest between the Establish'd Church and Dissenters, does not lye chiefly about their ordinary Lords-day-worship; but what occurs in other Offices, and chiefly about the corruptions and abuses of discipline, and 'tis no more then has been frequently suggested by the most judicious N. C. Divines that have wrote on the Subject of our Differences. But why does he pretend that I dissuade any Dissenters from joining with the Establish'd Church, (if he mean it concerning all occasional Communion with 'em) when I have so expressly declar'd my Judgment for it, and in vain urg'd him to the like declaration of his charity towards us, and never pretend to alledge our Differences in Reference to Worship or Discipline, as any argument against such occasional Communion in their ordinary Lords-day Service. There is no reason then to pervert what I have offer'd to such an uncharitable purpose, so that his following Observations are founded on a mistaken supposition. And therefore I shall content my self with these short Remarks on 'em.

1. I did then, and do still think it requisite to acquaint the Reader, that the Bp. had not in this Discourse so much as touch'd the principal matters in Difference between the Establish'd Church and the Dissenters, and particularly those to which this charge of *High Inventions* does most properly belong. And whereas he now tells us, that if He writ about Discipline, we should be less pleas'd with his performance; because *Admon. p. 165, 166.* he must look on the General frame of our whole Constitution as a meer Human Creature; &c. I must so far agree with him, That if he Treat that Subject in the same manner that he has done this about Worship, we shall certainly be less pleas'd with it, because all those faults that occur in the manner of handling this Subject will be the more aggravated if he repeat 'em on another.

2. Whereas the Bp. pretends, I desire to shift ground, and thence presume I apprehend some disadvantage in it. I do not find he has any reason for such a Triumph from my having avoided the consideration of any thing in his Book that carried the face of an Argument. Nor have I any need to multiply matters of Controversy from any Answer that his Lp. has yet given to the Remarks. And whereas he saith, *Admon. p. 46.* That I attempt not to justify their sitting at Prayers, nor their Omitting to add their Amen to their Prayers, nor the manner and frequency of their Communion, nor their way of singing Psalms; I shall only add, That for sitting at publick Prayer, I was no more oblig'd to defend any particular persons in that posture that indulge it out of sloth, then he to defend the Toying or Lauehing that's too often us'd in their Churches. But his Lp. was oblig'd either to defend his charging this upon our Opinion, as if we taught, That no postures of Reverence may be lawfully us'd and condemn'd; such as standing and kneeling as Relicks of Idolatry, or else to retract so hainous Calumnies as these must be, if they are untrue and ground.

groundless. For adding *Amen*, I shall if that will please the Bp. concur with him that 'tis more agreeable to Scripture Pattern, that the People pronounce it more audibly; But I hope this omission signifies nothing to his charge of *Human Inventions*. For the manner of celebrating the *Lords-Supper*, if it refer to the *posture*, I hope the Bp. is convinc'd, that *ours* is more agreeable to Scripture Pattern. For the *frequency* of it, I hope hee'll allow the generality of the Dissenters have much the advantage above the generality of the *Parish-Churches* by communicating much oftner. And for what concerns the Practice of the Dissenters in his Diocels, it has been already consider'd in the account of matters of Fact, and I have there shewn that their way of Administring it once a Year, is equivalent to it's being Administred thrice in the *Parish-Churches*, as to the frequency of their Members Communicating. And for singing *Psalms* I have already said enough to shew him that our Practice needs no Reformation, but rather his unreasonable prejudices against this part of Divine Worship, common both to them and us.

3. The Bp. need take no pains to prove, That my demands about the Reformation of the Discipline of the *Establish'd Church*, are not Arguments against all occasional Communion with 'em. For they were never propos'd for that End, but then I must tell him; That where there are in a Kingdom 2 Parties, or Bodies, of Protestants, in one of whom both the *Worship* and *Discipline* of Christ is more fully restor'd to it's primitive simplicity and purity, in the other there are some defects and corruptions left in their *Worship*, and *Discipline* almost entirely neglected or perverted and abus'd. I think every considerate Christian shoud prefer the stated Communion of that party, in which necessary Reformation has made a happier progress, and those better Reformed Churches, have no reason to Subject themselves to those corruptions they have Rejected. And moderate and wise Men will separate from the Churches of neither Party as if they were no true Churches and no part of the Church Catholick, but will rather to shew their regard to *Truth*, more statedly communicate with those on whose side it lies in the matters in Difference, and yet to express their *Charity* maintain occasional Communion with the other, so far as they can do it without Practising what themselves think unlawful.

4. Whereas the Bp. is so much displeas'd with those Requests that I have offer'd to the *Concl.* Clergy relating to those practices wherein we chiefly desire some Reformation of their present Discipline, and thinks me very unreasonable in proposing 'em, and cannot see to what good purpose they can serve; I shall to give him all the satisfaction I can, acquaint him with the true Reasons of my offering 'em.

1. I take the Abuses, of which some Reformation is there requested, to be the chief Obstacles to that happy Union among us, which has been so long the earnest desire of all good men, and I hope I can most sincerely say my own. So that I think none who have that end in their Eye can be reasonably blamed, for humbly proposing to publick consideration so proper and effectual means to attain it; from which I thought his Lp's *Discourse* had some tendency to divert the minds of men by amusing 'em with a new Dispute of *Human Inventions*. And therefore I thought this a every

very futable occasion to lay open the main grounds of our unhappy differences, that if any charitable persons should think of any attempts to compose them, they might by a true view of the *Disease* judge of the *Remedy* proper to heal it. And truly, till these Corruptions be reform'd, I see as yet little Reason to hope for any *concord* in our *practice*, tho I wou'd hope to see much greater in our mutual *Affections*.

2. I take these to be *abuses* which the generality of the most judicious and learned, as well as sober and charitable of the Conforming Clergy and Laity are sensible of, and wou'd readily concur in their desires and endeavours to reform, if they had a fair opportunity for it, so that I did not believe these *Requests* wou'd be any matter of just *offence* to them, nor do I yet find that they are. And for the *offence* of any that wou'd perpetuate our Divisions, by keeping up those Corruptions that are the chief Engine of 'em, because they are serviceable to their secular Interest, I think not my self much oblig'd to regard it. The glory of God, and concord of Christians are so much more valuable an Interest, that we may justly pursue it, tho it shou'd clash with the Humours, the Ambition or Avarice of Men, to which too many even of the *Clergy*, have too long Sacrific'd the more Precious concerns both of the Churches *Unity* and *Peace*.

There are Two things indeed which the Bp. Accuses those Requests, of which I am concern'd to consider.

1. That some of 'em are founded on most unjust Representations of their Practices and Principles, which if truly Represented needs no Reformation, As may appear (saith he) from his adding to, and taking from our 3 & 4 Canons p. 179. And may farther appear in the 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8. Admon. p. 171 11, 12, 13 Requests. Now I have review'd all these, and can see no such unjust Representations in 'em. So that I think, his Lp. had been more just, if he had, either never advanc'd this charge against me, or had taken the pains to prove it. Particularly, I cannot imagine, wherein I have added to these 2 Canons, in what I have cited of 'em, or why I must be said to take from 'em, because I only cite that part of 'em, which my *Discourse* there led me to take notice of.

2. He is pleas'd to insinuate, That I give ill Language in those Requests, and to that purpose saith. That I expose the Kingdom and Protestant Inhabitants of it, as again, overspread with Swearing, Profanation of the Lords-day, Uncleanness, Pride, Luxury, &c. An Imputation, (saith he) which I can by no means allow to be general; There being, I am persuaded by the goodness of God, a manifest Abatement of these in this Diocess.

Ans. I shou'd be glad to hear of such an Abatement of these Sins in his Diocess, and doubt not if true, that the Dissenting Ministers have been no way negligent to contribute towards it. But if the Bp. deny the Truth of this Complaint, concerning the generality of the Protestants of this Kingdom, as 'tis there deliver'd, he sees with other eyes, then any sober person I have yet convers't with. For Swearing and Profanation of the Lords-day, no good Man can converse in any part of the Kingdom, without being a sorrowful Ear and Eye-witness of it. Nor dos there appear any considerable abatement of those other crimes, from what was before,

besides what the diminution of Mens Estates have necessitated them to. So that I cannot imagine what *ill Language* it thou'd be, to mention and lament the revival of these Vices, and request all Ministers to concur in their endeavours, to preserve or reclaim those under their care from 'em. And I fear that the generality of Protestants among us, need the loudest call we can give 'em to *Repentance*, instead of such an undeserved Commendation as tends to persuade 'em, there is not so great and general a necessity of it. The common guilt is too great and too deeply aggravated, to be either conceal'd or extenuated, and deserves a fuller Description and a severer Reproof than I had then occasion for.

III. The 3d Allegation which the Bp. saith, I use to take off the force of his Book, is *That he hath omitted to handle that part of the Worship of the Establishment Church, against which the Dissenters have the greatest Exception, and Particularly what refers to Baptism.*

Admon. p. 54. *Ans.* I felt no such force in his Book, as needed this new Dispute to take it off. But 'tis true enough, That the debate about *Human Inventions* dos more particularly concern *Baptism* than the other parts of Worship his Lp. had insisted on.

And therefore, since the Bp. has offer'd us something new on this Subject. I shall the more willingly address my self to the Examination of it, because the precedent part of the Admonition, has left the Argument between us almost wholly untouch'd, and contains little but such slight cavils about it, as were in effect obviated in the *Remarks* themselves. And here,

I. The Bp. gives us the Reason why he omitted this part of Worship, *viz.*

Admon. p. 172, 173. 1. " Because it was occasional, not ordinary.

1. *Ans.* But he knew that in a Discourse about the *Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*, it was proper to consider that part of Worship about which that dispute chiefly lay.

2. " Because he found the Defects and Additions of our Directory so great in this Office, that they deserv'd a Discourse by themselves. And accordingly he mentions these following defects in the Directory.

1. " There is no expresse Covenant order'd in the Directory, to be made in the name of the Child Baptiz'd, either by the Parent or any else, tho' there be no other way of engaging a Child that cannot Covenant for it self.

2. " There is no profession of the Christian Faith required in the Directory from any Parent or Offerer of any Child.

3. " There is no solemn Recognition of the Vow of Baptism, requir'd from persons Baptiz'd in their Infancy, when they come to understand their Duty, As it is in Confirmation with us.

4. " The Expre's words of the Covenant, are not prescribed out of the word of God, but it is left to the Discretion of every Minister, to impose what he will on the Baptiz'd &c.

Ans. I know no great harm to the Cause of Dissenters, if we shou'd own there are some Omissions in the Directory; Especially when the Com-

Compilers, to avoid the rigorous and imposing humour, that had too long reign'd in others, seem to have left many things to the discretion of particular Pastors which they wou'd not positively enjoin. And for these defects which the Bp. has cited out of Mr. *Baxters Treatise of Infant Baptism*, they are not so material as his Lp. seems to imagine, and are easily supplied by every Minister that thinks more express professions requisite than are there positively enjoin'd.

Asto the *First, The making of an Express Covenant in the name of the Child*. If the Bp. mean by it, That the Parent shou'd explicitly profess his Dedicating his Child to God, and bringing it thereby under a solemn obligation to the Dutys of his Covenant, This is really included in that Profession; he is requir'd by the *Directory* to make of his desire to have it Baptiz'd; And accordingly 'tis usually for the Ministers to propose the Question more fully to this purpose, *do you profess your desire of having this Child Dedicated by Baptism to the Faith, Worship and Service of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?* But if he mean that the Parent or Offerer of the Child shou'd make such a Profession in the Childs name, as our Sponsors are order'd to do in the *Common-prayer-Book*, 'tis so far from being a Defect in our *Directory* that it enjoyns no such thing, that 'tis no small Blemish of the Office of Baptism in the *Service-Book*, that it requires such a Profession from 'em, as Personating the Child they present. And that his Lp. may be assured Mr. Baxter intended no such *Express Covenanting in the name of the Child* as this is. I shall produce his own words (and the rather because I take them to carry great weight and force in 'em.) In his *N Conformity Stated &c.* he brings in the *Lawyer* asking, 'What is your Fourth Objection against our way of Baptism?' To which the Minister thus Answers. That in Personating the Child, they say, that they (and so he by them) doth at present believe, renounce and desire &c. falsely intimating that Infants are at present bound to do this by another. And yet the same Men plead that God doth not accept him for the Faith of his Parents, when as God requireth no Faith or Repentance of Infants, but only that they be the seed of penitent Believers devoted to Christ. And in the *Catechism* 'tis said, that (Repentance and Faith are Requird of Persons to be Baptiz'd, and that Infants who cannot perform these, are Baptiz'd because they promise 'em by their Sureties, which promise when they come to Age, themselves are bound to perform). Where note, that the former *Common-prayer-book* had [They perform 'em by their Sureties] They perceiv'd that having said Faith and Repentance are requisite, Infants they saw must have at present what is requisite at present. And they knew that they had them not themselves, and so were fain to hold that the Sureties Faith and Repentance was theirs, and a performance of that requird condition. But the makers of the new Book saw that this wou'd not hold, and so they say; [Tho Faith and Repentance be requird of Persons to be Baptiz'd, yet Infants are Baptiz'd because they promise 'em by their Sureties to be hereafter perform'd.] amending the former Error by a greater or a double one, 1. Granting Faith and Repentance are pre-requisite, and yet confessing that Infants have neither of their own or Sureties for 'em, and yet are to be Baptiz'd. 2. Or making a promise of Future Faith and Repentance to be present Faith and Repentance. 3. Or tho Faith and Repentance

“ tance be requisite in those that are to be Baptiz’d; yet God will at present justify and save all that have it not in Infancy, because they promise it hereafter. All plain contradictions, as if they said, ‘Tis requisite in Persons to be Baptiz’d and ‘tis not requisite. L--- How wou’d you have ‘em have answer’d the e? M. Professed Faith and Repentance are requisite in adult Persons to be Baptiz’d; And in Infants that they be seed of the Faithful, devoted by them to God in Christ, according to his offer’d Covenant of Grace.

Thus far that accurate Divine, from whom his Lp may learn, that the modesty of the Compilers of the *Directory* which made their Orders about this matter, seem Defective by leaving some particulars to the prudence and liberty of particular Ministers, is far more excusable, then the assurance of those who impose in such solemn professions, things so confus’d and inconsistent. If there be any defect in their Orders, ‘tis easily supplied, but the mistakes of the *Service-Book* are remedilessly impos’d on all that Administer this Ordinance according to it.

For the 2d. defect, viz. ‘ That there is in the *Directory* no Profession of the Christian Faith requir’d from the Parent or Offerer of any Child. I think there is such a virtual Profession requir’d by the *Directory*, when it enjoyns the Minister to require from the Parent, a solemn promise to bring up his Child, in the knowledge of the Grounds of the Christian Religion, and in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord. For this implys his owning himself the Christian Religion; Besides that his being a known Professor of it, is presuppos’d to his Childrens Admission to that Ordinance. Nor does the *Directory* hinder the Minister from requiring a more express Profession from the Parent, of the Christian Faith, where it is doubtful whether he own it or no. And I am sure the Form of Baptism drawn up by the N.C. Divines at the *Savoy-conference* in their proposals for accommodation, does expressly require it; And I have observ’d it ordinarily requir’d, at least in general Terms.

For the 3d. and 4th. defects of the *Directory*, ‘ That there is no solemn Recognition of the Vow of Baptism requir’d of Persons Baptiz’d in Infancy, when they come to understand their Duty, as there is in the Confirmation practis’t in the Establish’t Church, And that the express words of the Covenant are not precribed out of the word of God. Tho I take this to be an Omission, and therefore have both my self practis’t and known many others practice that Confirmation recommended in the *Reformed Liturgy*, drawn up by the N.C. Divines at the *Savoy Conference*, (according to which, no Person Baptiz’d is admitted to the Lords Supper, till he be at years of Discretion, not only understand the Baptismal Covenant, but with his own mouth, and with his own Consent openly before the Church, ratifie and confirm it, and promise his faithful observance of it to the end. In which Liturgy there is also an excellent Form of the Baptismal Covenant, drawn up as agreeable to the Scripture as any I have yet seen) yet I think this Omission of the *Directory*, far more excusable then what the *Common-prayer-Book* imposes in reference to Confirmation, of which they have both made something too like a Sacrament, and also turn’d a very useful practice and agreeable to the general Rule

Rules of Scripture into a Childish Formality, as I had occasion to shew in the *Remarks*. 'Tis easier to supply such Defects than to remove such unreasonable Impositions.

I shall conclude this Head with observing that the Bp. has of all Men, the least reason to blame the *Directory* for these Defects; For unless he could produce express Scriptural Precept or Pattern for these things, which he saith the *Directory* has omitted (as I think no man can do it) he must according to his former Principles censure 'em for *Human Inventions*, and rather commend the *Directory* for omitting them.

For the Bp's charge against the *Directory*, for requiring Additional Conditions contrary to Scripture Precedents, of which he gives us only one Instance, viz. *It's ordering that Baptism be not Administred in private Places, but in the place of Publick Worship.* Admon. p. 174. and in the face of the Congregation. I suppose the Bp. will grant that it shou'd ordinarily be Administred in Publick, and if these words of the *Directory* were intended in the strictest sense they are capable of. I am sure the generality of Dissenters have recoiled from the rigor of this Rule.

II. The Bp. comes to shew that my Argument against the *Cross*, is of no force.

Of this he only gives us this short Account. Admon. p. 175. His great Objection against it is, That we make it a new Human Sacrament, and then it must be a Human Invention. And upon this the Bp. proceeds to give us a new Account of his own concerning the Nature of a Sacrament, and endeavours to shew that the *Cross* is not made a Sacrament by 'em according to that Account. Now tho I shou'd have thought it fairer to have propos'd the Argument in the same manner I had done, yet in order to the bringing this Debate to some issue, I shall do these Two things.

1. I shall set the Argument I had propos'd against the *Cross* in Baptism, in it's due light, by giving as distinct and clear an Account as I can, of the Nature of those parts of positive Worship which we call Sacraments, and applying it to the Subject in dispute.

2. I shall shew the insufficiency of the Bp's Answer to this Argument.

I shall set the Argument I had propos'd against the *Cross* in Baptism in it's due light, by giving a distinct and clear Account of the Nature of those parts of positive Worship which we call Sacraments, and applying it to the Subject in dispute.

And this is the more necessary, not only because the uncertain signification of the word Sacrament has involv'd this Subject in great obscurity and confusion, but especially because the Account which the Bp. gives of it, (when he supposes us ill instructed in it, and proposes to inform us better) seems to me not only indistinct but also very *long* and *defective*, omitting several considerable uses of Sacraments, which were the chief strength of this Argument against the *Cross*.

There are 2 Ordinances of positive Worship prescribed in the New Testament, viz. Baptism and the Lord's Supper; There have been Two Names

Names invented, and frequently us'd among Christian Writers, to signify the common nature of these 2 Institutions, that of *Mysteries* in the Greek Church, And that of *Sacraments* in the Latin, a word probably borrow'd from the Military *Oath* which Soldiers took with certain rites appointed for that End, and which was called the *Military Sacrament*. But 'tis the thing it self we are concern'd to enquire into. Now if we can fix upon the true general Notion wherein these 2 Ordinances of *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper* agree, we may thence easily infer what a *Divine Sacrament* is. For of that I am now speaking.

And if we attentively consider this matter, we may soon observe, that those two Ordinances of *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper* agree in this, that they are *Federal Rites*, or *Sacred Ceremonies* instituted by God for Publick Solemnizing the Covenant between him and us. And on the other hand, in this they differ, that the former is the sacred Rite, whereby that Covenant is first publickly Enter'd into, the latter is that, whereby 'tis renew'd. And accordingly these positive Institutions under the Gospel, succeed in the place of 2 parallel Ordinances, or federal Rites under the Old Testament, viz. *Circumcision* and the *Feasts upon Sacrifices*. By the former the Israelites were initiated into that Covenant made with *Abraham* and his Seed; By the latter their League of Amity and Peace with God, was (upon the Atonement made by *Sacrifices*) renew'd by these *Feasts* upon'em. Of which more may occur anon.

Now these sacred Rites that are appointed by God, both in our first publick Entrance into the Covenant and our publick Renewal of it at the *Lords Table* are designed for several uses, and principally for the Three following.

1. As representing signs for Instruction.
2. As obliging signs to Confirm and Ratify the Covenant Enter'd into.
3. As distinguishing Signs or Badges of our Profession, and the Relations we thereby are invested in.

All these uses of 'em must be carefully and distinctly Consider'd.

1. These sacred Rites are us'd in these 2 Ordinances, as *Representing signs for Instruction*. (The infinitely wise God condescending herein to our Infirmary and weakness.)

Thus *washing with water* which is the Rite appointed in *Baptism*, is by it's resemblance instructive to us, both concerning the *Priviledges* and *Duties* of the Covenant we enter into.

Concerning the *Priviledges*, Thus 'tis design'd to represent our Natural pollution and defilement, and the necessity of the *Regenerating* and *Purifying* Vertue of the Holy Spirit. And hence we are said to be born of *Water and the Holy Spirit*, i.e. formed to a new and divine Life by that sanctifying efficacy of the Holy Spirit, which is compar'd to the purifying Vertue of *Water*. And elsewhere in allusion to this Baptismal Rite, we are said to be *Saved* by the *Laver of Regeneration* and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, 3 Tit. 5.

May, this Rite seems also design'd to instruct us concerning our *Guilt* as well as *Pollution*, and of the necessity of our being *Clean'd* from it by the *Laver*.

Lower of our Mediators Blood. For the most judicious Expositors understand those words of *Anania*: concerning the *Remission of Sins*, when he saith to *Saul* upon his Conversion, *Arise and be Baptiz'd and wash away thy Sins; (or be thou wash'd from thy Sins.)* *calling on the Name of the Lord Jesus,* *18 Acts 26.* And accordingly such a cleansing vertue is ascrib'd to the Redeemers Blood; and that Expression of his *Washing us from our Sins,* in it, seems to carry an Allusion to this sacred Baptismal Rite. See *1 John 1. 7.*

1 *Rev. 5.*

The same sacred Rite is design'd to represent our Duty to us, viz. To renounce the dominions of Sin and of the World, and to consecrate our selves to a life of Holiness as *Christ's* purified peculiar People. And this use of it, the *Bp.* omits in his Account. To this Rite those Expressions seem to refer, *such were some of you, but ye are wash'd, ye are sanctify'd.* *1 Cor. 6. 11.* And thus the *Apostle* supposes in our Baptism, that there is a Resemblance of our *Dying with Christ,* and our *Rising with Him,* that shoud instruct us in our Duty, *As Dye to Sin and Live to Righteousness* *6 Rom. 3, 4, 5.* *2 Col. 12.* For our *Dying to Sin* and *walking in holiness of Life,* is not signified in Baptism as the Benefit confer'd by God, as the *Bp.* seems to suppose, but rather as the Duty requir'd from us, tho the renewing and purifying efficacy of the Holy Spirit, whereby we are enabled to do so, is signifi'd as a Benefit which we receive from God.

The same I might observe concerning that other Institution of the Lords Supper, in whose sacred Rites there is not only a Commemorative Representation of the Death of *Christ*, but also an *Instructional Representation* of our Spiritual Communion with Him in His Body and Blood, viz. in the precious Fruits of his Sacrifice, and of those Duties, or Exercises of our Faith and Devotion to Him, by which we are said to *Eat his Flesh and Drink his Blood.* *6 John 53, 54.*

I might observe the same concerning those 2 parallel Institutions under the Old Testament, *Circumcision* and *Religious Feasts upon Sacrifices.* But this use of Sacraments being so obvious, I shall not insist any farther upon it, but only add, That tho I suppose all *Sacramental* signs to be *Representative* ones, and to carry such an *Instructional Resemblance and Allusion,* yet I do not suppose all *barely instructive* signs to be *Sacramental* or *Federal* ones. For there seems to be more requisite to such.

2. The sacred Rites in Baptism and the Lords Supper are intended also as *obliging signs to Confirm and Ratify that Covenant that is then Enter'd into or Renew'd between God and us.*

'Tis evidently so in Baptism; for the sacred Rite there us'd is both,

1. An *Obliging sign on Gods part;* whereby he confirms and ratifies the promises of his Covenant; to all that are interest'd therein, even that grand comprehensive promise of being the *God of the Faithful and of their Seed,* and particularly that eminent promise of the *Remission of Sins.* See *17 Gen. 7, 11.* and compare it with *2 Acts. 38, 39.* *Repent and be Baptiz'd every one of you for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; For the promise is to you and your children &c.* And our being Baptiz'd into the *Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,* implies his engagement

engagement to be a Reconcil'd Father, Redeemer and Sanctifier, to all that sincerely devote themselves to Him. So in that other Federal Rite of the Lord's Supper, Art. 22. Luke, 22. v. said of the Cup, That in the New Testament in the blood of Christ, &c. This sacred Memorial of His blood is like an Authentick Seal set to the New Testament, wherein so many precious Legacies are convey'd to us as the Fruits of his Death and Sacrifice.

And the same may also be observ'd concerning Circumcision, both in the place fore quoted 17 Gen. 17. 10. and in it being call'd by the apostle Paul the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, &c. Of that right to impunity and life, which Abraham was as a Believer, entitl'd to thro' the merits of that Redeemer, who was his promised Seed). 4 Rom. 11.

So in their Religious Feasts upon Sacrifices, Gods admitting the Offerers or Guests to his Table, was a solemn Ratification of the League of Amity and Peace renew'd between em thro' the virtue of that future atoning Sacrifice of Christ, of which the legal ones were only Types and Figures.

2. This sacred Rite of washing with Water in Baptism is no less an obliging sign from us to God, whereby we bind our selves to the Duties of His Covenant.

Now this important use of a Sacrament, the Bp. not only Omits in his Description of it, but plainly Denies that it belongs to it's nature. For Admon. p. 180. he asserts it to be a Mistake, concerning Sacraments to suppose that they are signs from us to God, whereas he affirms em to be wholly (or only) signs from God to us. I confess this seems very surprizing, because if this be a Mistake, 'tis such a Mistake as he himself has run into in his Discourse. For there p. 4, he gives this reason, 'Why the Celebration of the Sacrament is a part of outward Worship, &c. Because in them we not only express our dependence on God for his grace, but likewise oblige and bind our selves to serve Him. Now how this can be true without making the Sacramental Rite a sign from us to God, of that obligation to his Service, I cannot comprehend. So that his Lp. seems to me in this particular inconsistent with himself, and speaks more accurately of these matters, where his partiality to his cause does not mislead his judgment. But since he now asserts this to be a Mistake and Demands some place of Scripture to prove this Notion of a Sacraments being a sign from us to God, (See Admon. p. 180) I shall endeavour herein to give him all reasonable satisfaction.

And this Account of Sacraments, I shall particularly prove in reference to Baptism, which is the Sacrament in dispute.

That Baptism is a sign from us to God of our Obligation to the Duties of his Covenant, as well as a sign from God to us of the Truth of his promises, is evident from the Ap. Peter's excellent Description of that Internal and saving Baptism which the External washing is the sign of, 1 Pet. 3. 21. That is, not the putting away the flesh of the Flesh, (i. e. Baptism in not merely or principally that) but the Answer of a good Conscience to God. Which words manifestly allude to the Covenant Transaction.

faction that passes between the great God and the Adult Person Baptiz'd.
 (For of such the Ap. here speaks) and to the *Questions* that were to that end
 propos'd to such as receiv'd this Seal of Gods Covenant. They were
 ask'd, *If they believ'd in the Lord Jesus with all their Heart?* (See 8 Acts 37) Or,
 as some antient Christian Writers propose the Question, 'If they re-
 nounc'd the Devil and his Angels, the World and it's Poms? If they
 believ'd in, If they devoted themselves to the Father, Son, and Holy
 Ghost, &c? And their sincere profession and promise of doing so,
 which in *Baptism* they ratify'd by this external Rite of washing with Water,
 is that which the Ap. here calls the *Answer of a good Conscience towards God*. So
 that the Ap. was so far from supposing that *Baptism* was not a sign from us to
 God, that he rather defines it by this part of it's end and use, viz. To be a
 solemn Rite whereby we profess to engage our Hearts to the Duties of his
 Covenant. And indeed since *Baptism* is the Solemnizing a mutual Cove-
 nant between the Blessed God on the one part, and our selves or our Seed
 on the other, it is first a sign from us to God, of our consent to the proposed
 Terms of his Covenant, before it can be a sign from Him to us, of our or
 our Childrens interest in those Benefits of his Covenant that presuppose
 our consent as the Condition thereof. 'Tis the *Baptism of Repentance for*
the Remission of Sins, 1 Mark 4, and is therefore first a sign of our Repentance
 towards God, before it can be a sign from him of the Remission of Sins.
 And so 'tis propos'd by the Ap. Peter at the first time we Read of it's Ad-
 ministrat[i]on to his adult Converts, 2 Acts, 38, 39. 'Repent and be Bap-
 tiz'd every one of you in the Name of Christ for the Remission of Sins,
 for the promise is unto you and your Children. Where they were by
 Baptism first to profess their Repentance towards God, and Faith in our
 Lord Jesus, and then receive the promised Benefit, *Remission of Sins*. Nay
 Christ's own Command to his Apostles, first, to Disciple or Profelyte all Na-
 tions and then to Baptize 'em, plainly implys that one great use of *Baptism*
 was to be a solemn Bond upon 'em, to the Duties of that Christian pro-
 fession they had embrac'd, and the Baptizing 'em in the Name of the Father,
 Son, and Holy Spirit, has been always suppos'd to imply a solemn Dedication
 of 'em, by this sacred Rite to the Faith, Worship, and Service of that
 Blessed Trinity, into whose Name they are Baptiz'd. There is in that In-
 stitution a Seal set to the Covenant of God on our part as well as on his,
 To which 'tis not improbable that those words of the Apostle Paul refer
 2 Tim, 2, 19. --- *Nevertheless the Foundation* (or as some render the word
Στοιχείον *Tabulae contractis* the Covenant) *of God stands sure, having this Seal*
 (on Gods part) *The Lord knows them that are His*, And (this Seal on our
 part) 'Let him that Names the Name of Christ depart from Iniquity.
 As the Covenant is mutual, so the External Rite is intended to ratify our
 Rescipulation as well as God's Promise, and accordingly our breach of the Bap-
 tismal Covenant by Apostasy or Infidelity is Perjury, and therefore so often
 in the Scripture Language represented by the breach of the Conjugal Vow,
 that the adulterers is guilty of. And this Notion of Baptism as an obliging sign
 from God to us, is the more unreasonably deny'd by the Bp. if we consi-
 der, that 'tis this very use of Baptism, that chiefly occasion'd the Name of
 a Sacrament being given to it, because Baptism was reckon'd (like the Mi-

litary Oath of the Roman Soldiers) as a solemn Lifting the Person Baptiz'd into the service and warfare of Christ against the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. So that the Bp has excluded that from the nature and notion of a Sacrament, which was the chief, if not the only ground, of this Rite of the Christian Religion being called one.

And it were as easie to shew the same concerning the other Institutions that are call'd *Sacraments*. Thus as *Circumcision* was a token of the Covenant between God and *Abraham* and his seed in their Generations; so twas an obliging sign on their part as well as on God's part. It oblig'd them to receive and obey the Revelations of the Divine will to 'em. And hence after the delivery of the Law of *Moses*, Circumcision was an external Bond on those that received it to observe that Law; as the *Ap. Paul* plainly intimates to us, *Gal. 3*. -- He that was Circumcis'd made himself a Debtor to the Law to do it, i. e. brought himself under a solemn Tye thereto by this External Rite.

That the Feasts upon Sacrifices under the Law were Federal Rites (in allusion to the general Custom of those Eastern Nations, to Confirm mutual Covenants by Eating and Drinking together, See *26 Gen. 30, 31. 31 Gen. 44, 45, 46. 9 Jos. 14. 41 Psal. 9. 5 Lam. 6. Obad. 7 v.*) is so largely prov'd by the Learned Dr. *Cudworth* in his excellent Treatise on the Lords Supper as a Feast upon a Sacrifice, that I shall refer the Reader to it for fuller satisfaction. And that one passage in the *50 Psal. 5 v.* is sufficient to put it out of Doubt. 'Gather my Saints together, those that have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice. Now the Covenant was made and celebrated, not merely by Offering it up, but chiefly by their Religious Feast upon it.

And as the Lords Supper succeeds in the place and stead of those Jewish Feasts upon Sacrifices, 'tis evidently design'd as such a federal Rite, whereby we renew our League of peace with God, upon the Memorials of the attoning Sacrifice of his own Son, by our renewed consent to the Terms of his Covenant; And hence the *Ap. Paul* warns his *Corinthian* Converts against the Idolatrous practice of Feasting in the Temples of the Heathen Idols, as inconsistent with the obligations which their Feasting at the Lords Table, had laid upon 'em to be the Worshipers of the only true God, who was too jealous of his own honour to admit of any Rival in it. See *1 Cor. 10. ch.* from the Fourteenth to the Twenty third verse.

3. These federal Rites of Baptism and the Lords Supper must be consider'd as intended also to be distinguishing signs of our Christian Profession and the Relations which we are thereby invested in.

Thus our Baptism is the honourable Badg of our Discipleship, whereby we are discriminated from the Infidel world. We do thereby put on the Livery of Christ (as those words of the *Ap. Paul* imply, --- *3 Gal. 27. For as many of you as have been Baptiz'd into Christ have put on Christ*) And therefore he adds, they were no more to be distinguish'd into Jew or Greek, &c. but all were one in Christ Jesus. This one Livery was to be the common sign of their belonging to him as their one Lord and Master. And accordingly our partaking of one external Baptism, is made a Mark and

and Character of those that belong'd to that one visible Body, or Church of which Christ is the Lord and Head, as our partaking of one internal Baptism is the certain Mark of our belonging to the one invisible Church, or mystical Body of Christ. See 1 Eph. 4, 5, 6. To the same purpose we Read elsewhere, that we are by one spirit Baptiz'd into one Body whether we be Jews or Gentiles; whether we be bound or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. The latter words, of being made to drink into one Spirit, according to the general consent of the best Expositors, refer to the Lords Supper, as the former do to Baptism, And the words plainly imply, that Baptism and the Lords Supper are the Symbol and the Bond of our external Communion as Members of the visible Church, as by partaking of the sanctifying Operations of the same Holy Spirit, we become Members of one mystical Body of Christ. So that by our Baptism, we are incorporated into the Christian Community, and thereby Discriminated in our right to it's external privileges from them that are without, who are yet *Aliens and Forreigners*. And so by the Lords Supper we are, as partakers of *Christ's holy Table*, distinguish'd from them that partake of the Table of Devils, and are in fellowship (or Communion) with them — 1 Cor. 10 20, 21.

Thus was Circumcision the discriminating Mark of these that embrac'd the Faith of Abraham, from such as were *Aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel* and strangers to the Covenants of promise. Circumcised and uncircumcised was equivalent to one that did or did not own the Jewish Religion.

Having thus far clear'd the General Nature and Uses of these 2 Institutions in the Christian Religion which we call Sacraments (for all the particular uses of each of 'em, I am not now concern'd to consider) I come to apply this account to the matter in debate.

And accordingly 'tis obvious to any that shall consider the foregoing account, that there is one Use of these foederal or Sacramental Rites that does necessarily presuppose Divine Institution, viz. *Their being obliging signs on Gods part to ratify his promises*. For it were too absurd for any to imagine that God will oblige himself by signs he never appointed for that end. And therefore the Papists themselves pretend their new Sacraments to be Divine ones by feigning Gods Institution for 'em.

When therefore I speak of a Human Sacrament, I mean no more by it, than an external Rite set up by meer Human Authority, without any pretence of Divine Institution, for several Sacramental Uses, such as constitute it as truly a part of Religious Worship as Baptism and the Lords Supper are: So that it wants nothing but Gods Instituting it to be a Seal to His part of the Covenant as Men have made it a Seal to Their part, to render it as proper a Sacrament as either of the 2 former. And 'tis only in this sense, that I suppose the Cross to be made a Human Sacrament by the Establish'd Church. 'Tis made by 'em a Sacrament as far as Men can make One of a Religious Rite that they can pretend no Divine Authority for. And this is sufficient to prove it a sinful Human Invention, as I shall now shew, in prosecuting the particulars here suggested.

I. 'The Cross is set up for several Sacramental Uses, even the like Uses as Baptism and the Lords Supper are appointed for.

For according to the foregoing account of these federal or Sacramental Rites.

1. 'Tis set up as a Representing or Instructive sign. And that both in the Duties and the Benefits of the New Covenant.

'Tis set up as Instructive in the Duties of it. And this the Bp. grants when he owns, (*Admon. p. 178*) 'That the Cross is us'd to signifie the 'Return we ought to make to God, for the Benefits receiv'd in Baptism. And indeed the words of the *Service-Book* put this out of doubt. *We sign this Child &c. in Token that he shall not be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ crucified, &c.*

'Tis set up as Instructive in the Benefits of the New Covenant. This indeed the Bp. denies in the place last quoted, and tell us, *The Cross is not us'd by 'em to signify any Grace or Benefit communicated from God.* But I think there is just ground to conclude the contrary from the Reason which the Convocation alledges for Retaining the use of the Sign of the Cross, viz. 'That the Holy Ghost by the Mouth 'of the Apostles did honour the name of the Cross so far, that under it 'he comprehended not only Christ Crucified, but the force, effect and 'merit of his Death and Passion, with all the comforts, fruits and promises we receive or expect thereby. See the 30th. Canon of the Ch. 'of England. Now I would gladly know what this Reason can signifie to vindicate their retaining the use of the Cross, unless they supposed it a fit external Sign to signifie the same things which the Holy Ghost had honoured the Name of the Cross to signifie. And this Inference seems the more just from the account they give of this Ceremony of Crossing as practis'd by the Primitive Christians, viz. 'That they signed their Children with the Sign of the Cross, when they were Christen'd, to dedicate 'em by that Badg to his service whose benefits bestow'd on 'em in 'Baptism the name of the Cross did represent. And consequently, The sign of it is design'd to represent too.

But

2. Which is more considerable, The Cross is made by the Establish'd Church an obliging and ratifying sign on our part to bind us to the duties of God's Covenant, even to the same which Baptism is appointed to oblige us to viz. 'To confess boldly the Faith of Christ crucified, To fight Manfully under his Banner against the Fleish, the World and the Devil, and 'to continue Christs Faithful Soldiers and Servants to our lives end. And I may still renew the *Quest:* propos'd in the *Remarks*, *What more peculiar Duties of the New Covenant cou'd Baptism oblige us to?* And to put the matter if possible out of doubt, the Infant is expressly said in the Canon to be by this

See Coll. of Cases *Fadg dedicated to the Service of Christ.* I know indeed the ingenious Author of the Case relating to the 2d Edit. p. 377. 378. *Cross in Baptism, distinguishes here between an immediate and proper, and an improper and declarative Dedication.* and accordingly wou'd persuade us that the Convocation only designed the latter; partly, because they refer to the words us'd in the *Service-Book* when the Child

is

is *Cross* partly because they suppose the Child Dedicated by *Baptism* before and suppose *Baptism* complete without the sign of the *Cross*. But I seem not that either of these Reasons warrant us to take the words of the Convocation in so very strait and improper a sense as this is, viz. That when they affirm the *Cross* to be a lawful outward Ceremony, and honourable Badg whereby the Infant is Dedicated to the Service of him that dy'd on the *Cross*, they shou'd mean no more then that 'tis a lawful outward Ceremony and Honourable Badg to declare that the Infant has been Dedicated to Christ by another outward Ceremony and Honourable Badg before. For 'tis evident that the words us'd when the Child is sign'd with the sign of the *Cross* do as fully and directly express a proper immediate Dedication as the words us'd when 'tis Baptiz'd, and therefore we have no reason from thence to apply so unusual and odd a sense to the words of the Canon and the Convocation supposing *Baptism* complete without the sign of the *Cross* done any way. Argue that they design'd not a proper renew'd Dedication by that *Cross*. For tho we are Dedicated by *Baptism* yet we properly renew that Dedication as oft as we attend the *Lord's Table*. And the *Romish Church* do it in their *Ritual*. Suppose the modern *Romish* Divine Right said it is not soles of this Sacrament then we do, and speak of their Ceremony as only pertaining to the Solemnity of that Sacrament, yet they use several other Rites for proper immediate Dedication, besides that of washing with water.

14. The *Cross* made a lasting sign of our Christian profession and the relations we are thereby engaged in to God and to the whole Church. For this evidently follows from it's being made the Honourable Badg of Dedication to the Service of a crucified Saviour. So that by being *Cross'd* we are truly (according to the Establish'd Church) wear the *Likey of Christ*, as by being Baptiz'd; And this *form* External sign is as effectually made the common Symbol and Test of our Discipleship, the mark of our belonging to Him as our Lord and Master, as the name *Christian* is. And thus I have now from hence I further infer, That the *Cross* is not a Sacrament as Men can make any sign of their own, for which they can produce no Divine Institution. 'Tis set up for end of the same *form* as *Baptism*, may for such uses as do constitute a proper part of positive worship, that has no stamp of Divine Authority, but is confessedly the matter of a Human Invention. For if (as the Bp himself supposes) *Worship* is displeasing to God, that is, as he supposes, if it is not as *Worship* is warranted by the Example of the *Major*, or (as he now adds) that cannot be by parity of Reason deduc'd thence, *Worship* is not a *Worship* truly pleasing to Him, and such as our Saviour justly desires for unto Himself, and are no way instituted or warranted at all those Rites in Religious Worship, whereby we oblige and dedicate our souls and bodies (or which is the same) Dedicate ourselves to the Service of him, a proper part of positive worship, is evident from the Bp's own confession, who (at the end of his *Discourse*) does therefore make the Sacrament to be a part of Religious Worship, not only on the account of our Expressing therein our Dependence on his grace

great of God, but likewise on the account of obliging and binding our selves by 'em to
 themselves. And doubtless, it does as properly belong to God alone to ap-
 point the Religious Rites whereby we bind our selves to his Service, as to
 the Supreme Magistrate to appoint the Ceremonies us'd in our taking the
 Oath of Fidelity and Allegiance. Nay it belongs to him alone to appoint the
 Honourable Badg of our Discipleship who receives us into his Holy Covenant;
 And no inferior Pastors or any more Authoriz'd to superadd any other
 Rite for his use, to that he has Instituted already, then the Servant of any
 great Prince, is warrant'd of his own Head to prescribe to his fellow ser-
 vants the wearing of a new Livery as an Honourable Badg of their belonging
 to such a Master, besides that which he has appointed of his own choosing.
 To set up external Rites for such Sacramental uses as these, viz. Not on-
 ly to instruct us in the privileges and Duties of the New Covenant, but
 to oblige and bind us to 'em, and to be the Honourable Badg of our Christian pro-
 fession, when God has already instituted other Rites for these very ends, is
 a piece of presumption we dare not be guilty of; 'Tis an offering Him
 a part of Worship which has no stamp of his Authority, which therefore we
 have no reason to hope He will accept; nay which there is no shadow of
 Reason for, if his own federal Rites be sufficient for all the ends they are
 appointed for.

Having thus stated my Argument, I come for answer to the second
 II. To shew the insufficiency of the Bp's Answer to this Argu-
 ment.

All that I can find, he has directly reply'd to my Argument, is only this.
 "That the whole force of it seems to proceed from 2 Mistakes concern-
 ing the nature of Sacraments, First, As if they were signs from us to God,
 and not wholly from God to us. Secondly, As if we were to learn the true
 Nature of Sacraments from the Schools and partial Definitions of inte-
 rested Disputants, and not from the Holy Scriptures. Hence saith the
 Bp. he has not given us one place of Scripture, to prove his imperfect
 Account of a Sacrament.

Asto this Answer to the Argument, I need do no more for the Refuta-
 tion of it, then refer the Reader to the foregoing account of a Sacrament,
 wherein I fully prov'd concerning Sacraments in general, and particularly
 that of Baptism, that they are as truly and properly signs from us to God, as
 from God to us; nay that they cannot be the Latter without being the For-
 mer. And this I have prov'd, not from the Dictates of the Schools, but
 from the Omnipotence of God; having quoted no other Human Authority, but his
 own, and I hope he will not reckon himself one of those Partial and inte-
 rested Disputants he speaks of. So that 'tis not the force of my Argument
 but of his Answer that proceeds from a Mistake.

But I suppose his Lp. may lay more stress upon his account of a Sacra-
 ment, and his application of it to vindicate the *Cross*, which therefore I
 shall also briefly consider.

To this purpose, he acquaints us, "There are 3 Things necessary to
 make up a Sacrament.

First, an outward Visible sign instituted by God, signifying some spi-
 ritual grace we expect from him.

Secondly.

Secondly, an obligation on God by some promise of his to grant us that Spiritual Grace or Benefit whenever we duly use the Visible Sign.

Thirdly, our use of this Visible Sign, without which we are not to expect the Spiritual Benefit if we wilfully neglect it.

Accordingly the Bp. thinks me obliged to prove that these Three things concur in the *Cross* in Baptism, viz. That the Establish'd Church teaches That the *Cross* is instituted by God to signifie some Spiritual Grace we expect from him, and that he has oblig'd himself by promise to grant us that Spiritual Grace upon the use of the *Cross*, and will deprive us thereof if we neglect it.

Now to shew the insufficiency and weakness of this Answer, I need only suggest these two things.

1. The Bp. has in this account of Sacraments omitted several of those uses and ends for which they were appointed, and particularly those from whence the Force of this Argument is deriv'd. For he neither considers their being made *representing* signs to instruct us in the duties of the New Covenant, nor (which should have been chiefly observ'd) their being *obliging* signs to bind us to 'em, nor their being *distinguishing* badges of our Profession and Communion. And yet these are very important uses of those Federal Rites of Baptism and the Lords-Supper, and such as chiefly occasioned their being called *sacraments*.

2. He expects I shou'd prove that which my Argument no way obliges me to, viz. That the Establish'd Church teaches, That God has oblig'd himself by promise to grant us some Spiritual Benefit upon our use of this Sign of the *Cross*, and will deny that Benefit to all that neglect that Sign. Now tho' he might justly have expected Me to prove this, if I had said, That the Establish'd Church feigns the *Cross* to be a *Sacrament* of God's appointment, and uses it as such; Yet 'tis evident from the foregoing account, that 'tis unreasonable to expect it in what I call a *Human Sacrament*. For when I suppose it made a *Human Sacrament*, I intend no more, then that 'tis made a *Sacrament* as far as Men can make one of a Religious Rite of their own. Now they may make it a sacred Federal Rite to oblige and bind themselves to God's service, tho' 'tis absurd to expect they shou'd make it a Rite to oblige God to confer his Benefits. And their setting it up to this former Sacramental use (as well as other uses aforementioned) is sufficient as I have shewn him from his own Principles to make it a sinful *Human Invention*, as every part of Worship is that has no stamp of Divine Authority. So that I can easily allow the Bp. without any prejudice to my Argument, That to be a Seal of God's part of the Covenant, is so necessary to a true and Divine Sacrament, that what wants that, is but the lifeless Image of one. But Men may presumptuously appoint Rites of their own to so many *Sacramental* uses, as shall as truly render 'em Parts of Divine Worship as Divine Sacraments are, tho' they do not suppose God oblig'd to confer his Benefits on all that use them, and by doing so, they set up such *Vain Worship* as our Saviour condemns as only taught by the Precepts of Men. 15. *Matth.* 8, 9. compar'd with 29 *Isa.* 13. So that the Bp. here only cavils at the name of *Human Sacraments*, while he

over-

overlooks the plain force and stress of the Argument which depends not on the Name at all, but on the Use, for which the Cross is appointed. And I have shew'd 'tis appointed for all but that one that necessarily supposes Divine Institution.

But because the Bp. now pretends to a Divine Warrant for the use of the Cross to those purposes for which he supposes it appointed by the Establishment Church, 'Tis requisite I shou'd consider what he has offer'd on that Head.

H. The Bp. undertakes to shew, That the use of the Cross in Baptism is Warranted by Scripture.

His Argument to prove this is drawn out to a considerable length from p. 186. to p. 187. And that I may not wrong him in contracting it, I shall take this method in what I shall offer against it.

First, I shall shew, That the Bp's Argument does not reach the main Use of the Cross which he was concern'd to defend.

Secondly, I shall shew that the same Argument will justify many other Rites added by the Romish Church to Baptism and other parts of Worship, which they have rejected as well as we.

Thirdly, I shall consider the distinct Propositions the Bp. has lay'd down, and shew where I judg the Argument in 'em to be weak and unconvincing.

First, I shall shew that the Bp's Argument does not reach the main use of the Cross which he was concern'd to defend.

For he was chiefly oblig'd to defend the Crosses being made a Dedicating sign, whereby we bind our selves to the Service of Christ, and thereby a common distinguishing Badg of our Christian Profession; whereas in his Argument he attempts to prove no more, then that the Scripture does warrant our using it as an Instructive sign to signify or express this particular Duty of our Glorifying in the sufferings of Christ. Now tho I do not think he has produced us any clear Scriptural warrant for this very use of the sign of the Cross, yet if he had, what he has said falls very far short of justifying those other more important uses of it, which are more peculiar to sacred or Sacramental Rites, viz. It's being a Rite of Dedication to the Service of Christ, and thereby the Livery or Badg of the Christian Profession.

Secondly, I shall shew that the Bp's Argument will serve as well to justify many other Rites, which the Romish Church has added to Baptism and other parts of Worship.

As to Baptism, A Papist may from the Bp's Argument draw the following Plea for several other Ceremonies added to it by the Roman Ritual, such as the Priest's putting Salt into the mouth of the Infant, his Anointing his Ears and Nostrils with spittle, his putting a Lighted Taper into the Infant's or God-father's hand, his putting a white Garment on him, &c. We are oblig'd (saith the Bp.) to express the inward sense of our minds concerning God by outward means, the Scriptures command to express it by our Actions as well as Words; as to these outward Actions, we are to use such as the general custom of our Country, has made significant in the like cases. Thus because making the sign of the Cross is an Action, which universal custom has applyed to signify our glorifying in the suffer-

ings

ings of Christ, and 'tis proper to make a Profession of doing so in our Baptism. Therefore the Scriptures warrant our use of it in general, and particularly at that time. *Aamon. p. 181, 182, 183.*

Since then, (may the Papists in *Italy or Spain* argue) 'Tis our *Lut* to *Savour the things of God*; To have our *Lips Season'd with Wisdom and Grace*; To open our *Ears* to the *Doctrine of Christ* as becomes his *Disciples*; To preserve our *Garments clean* by immaculate purity of *Life*, that we may appear faultless before the *Tribunal of Christ*; To walk in the *Light* by a blameless observance of our *Baptismal Vow*, that we may with the *wise Virgins* be admitted to the *Heavenly Nuptials*; Nay, since 'tis as proper to make a profession of all this in our Baptism as of *Glorying in the sufferings of Christ*; And since the Scriptures warrant us to make that profession not only by *Words*, but also by such *Actions* as the *Universal custom* of our *Country* has made significant to those *Uses*, We are thereby warranted to use all the *Rites* so mentioned in the *Celebration of Baptism*, since by the *universal custom* of our *Country*, they are applied to signify our *Obligation* to these undoubted *Scr. Rit. Rom. Duties of Christianity*.

Nay, the *Bp's* Argument will go farther. For since 'tis as lawful to profess our *Glorying in the sufferings of Christ* in other parts of Religious worship as in *Baptism*, and universal custom has applied this Action to signify our doing so, why do we not imitate instead of blaming the *Papists* for their so frequently *Crossing* themselves in all their Devotions? Or rather since the Scriptures *Command* us to express the inward Religious sense of our minds by *Actions*, Nay, since (as the *Bp.* Asserts) Scripture Precedents, not only *Warrant* but *Oblige* us to use such *Actions* as well as *Words*, as by universal custom signify our *glorying in the sufferings of Christ*, How come we to lay aside so pious a custom, so commendable, nay so necessary an Expression of our Devout respect to a crucified Saviour, which we are not only *Warranted*, but *Oblig'd* to use?

Nay, as the *Romish* Church has in other parts of Divine Worship introduced a great number of *Actions* or *Rites*, to express some part or other of our Christian Duty or Devotion, and those *Actions* are rendered significant to that purpose by *universal custom* among those of that Church, 'Tis plain by this Argument that all those *Rites* are warranted by *Scripture*, and our first Reformers seem to have been very unreasonable in their Rejection of 'em. So that this loose way of Reasoning will serve to worse purposes than I hope his *Lp.* ever design'd it; For it will altogether as well fit the mouth of a *Papist* for justifying his observance of most of those Numerous *Rites* and Ceremonies (or in the *Bp's* Language, significant *Actions*) which their Church has enjoyn'd, as it does his for justifying the *Cross* in *Baptism*. If the *Bp.* shou'd pretend that the numerousness of those *Rites* is the only fault of 'em, he wou'd do well to acquaint us where we may stop, what number of 'em is innocent, and what becomes sinfully excessive.

Thirdly, I come to examine the Propositions the *Bp.* has lay'd down for proving the use of the *Cross* in *Baptism* to be warranted by Scripture, and shew wherein I think his Argument in 'em weak and un-concluding.

That we are according to Prop. the 1st. to express our inward Reverence or Worship of God by outward means, such as Praise, Prayer, &c. will be freely granted.

That we are according to Prop. the 1^d. and 3^d. to express that Inward Worship in general, by such Bodily gestures, as of her nature or civil custom direct us to, and render most fit to represent and testify it to others by, will be also own'd. But I cannot so easily grant, that the Scriptures warrant our expressing the sense of our minds in all Religious Things or Matters by significant Actions. The particular Duties we owe to God, are almost Numberless. And if we were warrant'd by Scripture to express the Thoughts and Sense of our mind, as to each of 'em by some significant Rite and Ceremony, The Romish Church wou'd be sufficiently authoriz'd by Scripture in her introducing such a load of significant Rites and Ceremonies into Christian Religion, especially, if (as the Bp observes) such significant Actions be more effectual and sincere expressions of the sense of our minds, then words.

Tho' then the Scriptures enjoyn Bodily Worship in general, and consequently warrant all such devout Postures as either Nature or civil Custom, has Taught us to express it by, as Bowing, Prostration, Kneeling, standing, and (in these parts of the World) the mens being uncover'd, yet they do not warrant us to contrive distinct significant Actions to express each distinct part of inward Worship, as one to express our Faith in God, another to express our Love to Him, another our Hope, another our Subjection to his Authority, another our Resignation to his disposal, another our Dread of his Justice, &c. So tho' we may testify our Worship of Christ as the Incarnate Word, by the forementioned Postures of Devotion, yet the Scriptures no where warrant our contriving one significant Action or Rite to express our Believing his Gospel, another to express our Reliance on the virtue of his Merits and Sacrifice, another to signify our Subjection to his Royal authority, another to declare our Glorifying in his Cross or Sufferings. Besides the Religious Postures that are expressive of Worship in general, the Scriptures require no other external Rites as signs of our particular respect to Him, besides those of being Baptiz'd in his Name, and Commemorating his Death by Receiving the Bread and Wine, as the sacred Memorials of it. Therefore,

As to the 4th and 5th Prop. Tho' 'tis our Duty to Glory in the Sufferings of Christ, yet the Scripture does not warrant (much less oblige us, as the Bp. adds) to contrive any particular Rite or Ceremony to signify it, any more then to contrive such a Rite to signify our Belief of his Gospel, or dependance on his Mediator, or Subjection to his Government. The Scriptures command our expressing our inward Worship, by Reverence in our Bodily Postures, and consequently Uncovering the Head, is to us a Particular included in that general Precept. But the Scripture no where commands us to signify this Particular Duty of Glorifying in the sufferings of Christ by any external Rites, and therefore does not warrant any Particular Rite for that end; For that wou'd have been, to have left a gap open for bringing in an endless Train of such significant Rites of our own devising, into Christian Religion, even such as wou'd have made the Yoke of Christianity as heavy as that of Judaism was.

As to the 6th and 7th, *Prop.* It plainly follows from what has been suggested, That if the Scripture, neither oblige nor warrant us to contrive an external Rite, for signifying our *Glorying in the Cross of Christ*, much less does it Warrant our use of it in *Baptism*, where there is an external Rite appointed by Christ himself, sufficiently expressive of the whole of our Duty to Him. What if the same Authority that set up this aery sign of the Cross, had appointed *leaning on a material Cross* to signify our Faith and Reliance on the Merits of a crucified Saviour, and *Kissing a Scripture* to signify our Homage to Him as a King, &c. and had introduc'd these Rites into the Office of *Baptism*? Could they justly pretend the Scripture warranted 'em, because it enjoins Faith in a crucified Saviour, and Subjection to Him as our Exalted Head and Lord? And yet these would be as fit Actions to signify these Duties as the making that aery sign to express our *Glorying in the Sufferings of Christ*. But the Scriptures have given no countenance to such foolish Inventions of our own, nor open'd any such door to our fancies, which at endul'd this way, will soon prove very fruitful in such superstitious Devices; As the Church has learnt by the sad experience of so many ages, in which the multiplicity of such Rites, (or in the Bp's. Language Significant Actions) had almost Eaten out the Vitals of Religion.

For the 8th *Prop.* I shall consider the particular Instances of such significant Rites in Religious Worship, for which the Bp. produces Scriptural Precedents, and by which he thinks this Ceremony of Crossing equally warranted.

For that of *Christ's washing his Disciples feet*, I cannot see what it should signify to his purpose. For who doubts but Christ might Teach his Disciples Humility, by practising before their Eyes a common, but in Him a most condescending Instance of it. Or that he might improve that occasion (as he did almost all occurrents) to remind 'em of the Necessity of being wash'd in his Blood or purify'd by his Grace. But what's this to our appointing a new external Badg of our Dedication to Christ, besides that he has appointed already?

For the 2d Rite of *Dipping entirely under Water in Baptism*, If the Bp. had prov'd both that the words of the Apostle did certainly refer to the Practice of *Dipping under Water*, assigning this Spiritual signification to that particular Rite; and yet that the Christians of that Age had arbitrarily, and without any warrant from Christ or his Apostles, set up this Mode of *Baptizing* as a Religious Rite to signify their Obligation to die to sin, and live to Righteousness in conformity to the Death and Resurrection of Christ, Then indeed this Instance had signified something to his purpose, but unless he prove both these particulars, It signifies nothing.

And the same Answer may be applyed to the next Rite, viz. *The change of Cloaths*. He should have first prov'd that the Apostles words do certainly refer to such a Religious Rite practis'd in Baptism to signify our obligation to put off the old Man, and put on the new; and then prov'd this was the Rite meerly introduc'd by arbitrary custom, without any warrant from Christ.

For

For if the Apostles expressions refer to these two Rites as us'd to these purposes, It will be much more reasonable to conclude that they are a part of the Ordinance of Baptism, and consequently shou'd still be retain'd and us'd by us; (unless we suppose that as to the former, that maxime of our Saviour will warrant our Omission of it in this colder Climate, *That God will have mercy and not sacrifice*) And on this supposition the Bp. can draw no Argument from hence to his purpose.

For the *Feasts of Charity* and the *Holy Kiss*, I do not see that they were Religious Rites at all, but rather real Expressions of their mutual Charity. If the richer sort in a Congregation should on the Lord's-day invite the poor to Dinner, This wou'd be such a real instance of their Love, (agreeable to our Saviour's Advice about Feasting, *Luke 14. 12, 13, 14.*) as those *Feasts of Charity* were, but it wou'd be no such symbol of their spiritual Communion as their Feasting at the Table of the Lord is. And the same may most probably be said of the *H. Kiss*, which being then a common instance of mutual Respect and Amity among persons in their ordinary Assemblies, was therefore innocently continued in their Religious ones. As no doubt we may there pay the same marks of our Respect and Friendship to each other when the Publick Worship is over, that we do on other occasions of meeting together. Nay if we suppose these two to have been Religious Rites, yet it will be then more reasonable to suppose they had a temporary Institution, then that they had no other warrant then meer arbitrary custom. And upon either of these suppositions there can be no shew of any Argument drawn from 'em, to prove that the Scripture warrants us to institute a Religious Rite of our own as an honourable Badge whereby we are dedicated to the service of a Crucified Saviour, when Christ himself has instituted one for that use. For this is that which the Bp. was concern'd to produce a Scriptural Warrant for. And therefore I may justly add here, that tho the Bps'. Argument had prov'd that the Scriptures warrant us to express our glorying in the Sufferings of Christ, by Crossing our selves as the Primitive Christians did in their common Conversation, yet this wou'd not prove that they warrant us to use it as a Religious Rite in Baptism for our solemn Dedication to the service of Christ, because that is a needless doing that over again by a Rite of our own devising, which is sufficiently done before by a Rite of Christ's Institution. Whereas this is the thing in Question, and which to us looks like sinful Presumption.

But before I dismiss this Argument of the Bp's, 'tis requisite I shou'd consider those 2 significant Ceremonies among the Dissenters, which he thinks liable to the same exceptions as the use of the Cross in Baptism, viz. Their giving their Children names at their Baptism, and giving Tickets to Communicants.

For the former significant Ceremony, viz. Of giving names to Children at their Baptism, The Bp. tells us, It signifies the giving up their Names to Christ, and engaging 'em to be his Servants. So that our Names are a lasting Token and Badg to us of our Dedication to the Service of Christ, and an Obligation on us, to behave our selves accordingly. *Admon. p. 184.*

Ans.

Ans. It seems somewhat strange the Bp. shou'd so positively assert, That we give our Children a Name at Baptism for any such purpose as this. For we use it not as any Religious Ceremony at all, much less as an *External Sign or Token of giving up their Names to Christ, and engaging 'em to be his Servants.* This is all suggested by his own fancy without any ground: For we know of no other use of this practice in Baptism, then that the Person Baptiz'd may be notifi'd to the Congregation, by being call'd by his Name. And for the Bp's Remark on God's giving *Abraham a new Name at his Circumcision* in allusion to the Custom of *Masters giving their Servants a new Name upon their Admission into their Families,* Besides that 'tis asserted without any proof, (there being no such reason but a different one, assign'd by God himself, for changing his Name from *Abram to Abraham.* 17 Gen. 4. 5-) Yet if it were true, I know not what use it can be of to his purpose. For if he wou'd infer from it, That this is a Scriptural Warrant for giving Names to Children at Baptism, as a Token of their Admission into Gods Family, he makes it a significant Ceremony of Gods own Appointment, and consequently can draw no argument from it, to justify the use of the Cross as a ceremony arbitrarily appointed by Men, to signify their Dedication to Christ.

For the other significant Ceremony, which the Bp. saith, the Dissenters have added to the Lords Supper, and which he desires 'em to reflect on, viz. *Giving of Tickets* to such as are to be admitted thereto, 'Tis, I confess a very *dangerous* one, In which he has found out abundance of very strange and mysterious significations. For in this Ceremony he tells us, ' There is an Outward and Visible Sign, a Ticket. Secondly, An Inward ' Spiritual Grace, our Aptitude and Title to the Lords Supper and Communion of Saints, found upon our Examination when we Receive the ' Ticket. Thirdly, 'tis a Badg and Token whereby priviledg'd Members ' are distinguish'd from thole that are without. Lastly, 'tis a sort of necessary Term of Communion, since thole that neglect this Badg, shall ' not be admitted to the Sacrament.

Ans. If all these wonderful spiritual significations assign'd to this poor Ticket, prove merely the product of the Bp's Imagination, then I hope there can be no argument drawn from it to patronize the Cross. The Ticket is I confess an *outward and visible sign*, but I cou'd never learn before that it was a sign of any thing more, then that the person that brought it, was allow'd by the Minister to communicate at that time, and did not intrude there without his permission. But how it shou'd come to signify a Mans *Qualifications* for Receiving, or his *Title* to any spiritual benefits that belong to worthy Communicants, is very hard to conceive. All that can be said of it is, that 'tis probable the Minister wou'd not have given him leave to Communicate by giving him a Ticket, if he had not known him to be a Member of his own or some other Congregation. And the Bp. farther mistakes in making the Ticket a Badg to distinguish priviledg'd Members from those that are *without*, for there may be many present as *spectators* at Communion that are *Members* and have not Tickets at present, because they do not at present Receive. Nor wou'd any Man's having a Ticket secure his Admission, if he were known to be no Number of That or some Other Congregation.

gregation. Nay the Ticket is no necessary Term of Communion neither, since no man that is a noted Member of that or any other Congregation wou'd be refus'd, tho he shou'd have no Ticket or have left it behind him. It's plain, that the giving those Tickets is a circumstance that genuinely falls within the Apostles Rule of *doing all things decently and in order*. Now in such multitudes as in the North of Ireland ordinarily frequent their Communion, there cannot be a more easie and orderly expedient to distinguish the Communicants from meer Spectators, and prevent any persons from intruding into the Communion of Particular Churches without leave, then this of giving Tickets to such as they allow to Receive at that time. So that the general Rule of Scripture forementioned, dos oblige 'em to use this or some other method of the like kind, for the decent and orderly celebration of that Holy Institution. and preventing the contrary confusion and disorder. But I hope the Bp. will not pretend that Baptism cannot be decently and orderly perform'd without using the sign of the Cross as an Honourable Badg whereby the person Baptiz'd is Dedicated to the Service of a crucified Saviour, and therefore the Cross is no way warranted by that Rule of order and decency, as the forementioned custom evidently is. If indeed this perilous Ticket had had a Cross upon it, and the persons that brought it were order'd to wear it on their Breasts or Foreheads, as a sign whereby they publickly profess their Remembrance of and renewed Dedication of themselves to the Service of a crucified Saviour, as the adult Members of his Church. The Bp. might then have had some pretence to have compar'd these Custom together. But as they are really practis'd, there is no more resemblance between 'em, then between a prudential Mode of ordering Christs own Institution in general necessary, and virtually included in his own Rule of order, and an unnecessary Religious Rite unwarrantably added by Men, to Christs Institution, to some of the same uses as he had appointed another already. And any one that pleases may easily discern a wide difference between these two.

I shall only add here, that as the Bp. has failed of producing us any clear Scriptural warrant for the Cross, (and consequently ought by his own Rule on that very score to discard it as a Human Invention) so he has not so much as attempted to Vindicate that other Human Invention of God-Fathers and God-mothers set up to exclude the publick promise of Parents, for the pious Education of their own Children, and to enter into rash Vows, which few ever perform, which I take to be the more dangerous corruption of the two. See Remarks p. 167, 168, 169.

As to the Bp's Conclusion I shall only Observe.

1. I do not find that he has made good his Charge of Human Invention, against the Dissenters in any one particular instance of their Worship, notwithstanding all the assurance wherewith he had asserted, *Diss.* p. 187. That they were so strangely misled as to content themselves to meet together, perhaps for some years with a design to worship God, when one cou'd hardly see any thing of God's immediate appointments in their Meetings. For this the Bp. there saith, was manifestly the case of the Dissenters in his Thoughts. And he still takes the same for granted. *Admon.* p. 188. That the worship of Dissenters has no express warrant of Scripture for it. And now to advance so terrible and comprehensive

hensive a Charge, and not prove the Truth of it in any one particular Instance, seems to us a very *unavailing* as well as very *uncharitable*, Attempt. Nay 'tis strange, that (except that of *Crossing*) he has not so much as Endeavour'd to Vindicate one Practice of the Establish'd Church from his own Arguments when Retorted upon himself.

2. Since the Bp. Threatens us, if the matters of Fact be disputed, to produce his *Vouchers* and *Authentics*, we must now desire him either to do so, or own those mistakes whereby he has highly injur'd the Reputation of his Brethren. And I hope he will take care that the Testimony of his *Vouchers* be as credible as that of those I have produc'd. And he need not spare to produce 'em out of *Tenderness to the Dissenters of his Diocese*, for they desire no other *Tenderness* in this point besides that of speaking nothing but Truth of 'em.

3. I think his Caution against the Remarks which he here gives very unfair, unless he had prov'd instead of barely asserting, That my Arguments are not founded on Scripture, and that my Answers to his Proofs *unravel the Letter of Scripture*. I hope his Lp. will Excuse us, tho we are unwilling to take all this for granted on no other evidence than his bare word.

Lastly, I hope he will find nothing in these Papers contrary to a *spirit of meekness* or favouring of *Passion*. And tho the Dissenters of his Diocese cannot carry their civility to so high a strain as to thank him for his Book, as he does them for the entertainment they have given it, yet they can readily comply with his Request to 'em, *Not to be offended with him for telling 'em the Truth*. For the chief offence they took at his Book, was not his reasoning against their Opinions and Practices, but his giving so *untrue an Account* of 'em. And therefore they cannot altogether assent to what his Lp. insinuates in these following words, * Remember nothing is more apt to provoke Mankind than Truth. And if you meet with any Book in Answer to mine, that discovers the writer to have been in a Passion when he wrote it, you may look on it as a probable Argument of the Truth of what I have propos'd. And if upon Reading what I have wrote, you find any motion in your selves towards Passion, consider well whether it proceed not from the same cause, namely my declaring the Truth to you. For they think there is one thing more apt to provoke even the mildest and best of Men, and that is, to be unjustly Accus'd to the world, and yet, when the Accuser is admonish'd of his mistakes, to have the Accusation renew'd and be appeal'd to themselves as Evidences for what they as certainly know to be untrue, as they know their own Judgment and Practice. For in this case they think it no probable Argument of guilt in the Accus'd, if they shou'd express some just displeasure against such ill usage. And yet I hope he will find even this extraordinary provocation has not drawn out any Language that looks like Passion. But yet as the Bp. expects we shou'd allow *Plain-dealing* to be part of his Character, so I hope he will not deny us the same liberty of dealing plainly with him, not only in Vindicating our Opinions and Practices where we think his Objections against 'em invalid, but especially in clearing both from such misrepresentations as we think manifestly groundless and injurious.

injurious, and in deliv'ing an ingenuous Retraction of em, and in shew-
ing a regard to *Justice* as well as *Truth* should promp'tly be a *Refrain* to
Justice forbids our ascribing to our Brethren Opinions and Practices which
are none of theirs. May it forbid our Receiving and Publishing an
Account of em, from the Insinuations of others, when a little more
diligence might have enabled us to discover the falshood of em. And
consequently the same Brethren should be prompt to do all to the Reputa-
tion of our Brethren, when we have rais'd our unwary credulity, or in
the heat of Opposition, spoken overruen of em what is not true, and
what if better it would imp'ore to very unjust and unreasonable
imputations of their Judgment and Fidelity. And when he has shew'd
the Diffidence of his Brethren the evidence of this fact is before em,
they will then be more ready to believe his *Sincerity* in *Speaking* their
Good.

and why if these Papers contribute anything to reconcile us to L^d. and those whom his *Gift and Allowance* may have mislead, so more charitable thoughts of our Weakness, and to cause us in such Debates as relate to the more solemn observing their excellent Rules of the *Species* 4 Eph. 15. To speak the *Truth* Love, I find that think my pain in writing 'em wholly lost. For the importance in Dispute between us, It becomes every good Man as to his own Practice to adhere impartially to the Rule of the Holy Scriptures as far as he understands it, yet nothing is more plain, then that those great Truths and Duties of Christianity wherein we are *agreeable* of incomparably greater moment and importance then those wherein we *disagree*. And as tis our Unity in these more important Truths and Duties that chiefly *recommend* us to the Acceptance of our blessed Lord, so that alone is sufficient to *unite* us to *one another*, And for those smaller Differences among us that are so fully consistent with a happy Unity in these essentials of our Religion, however they may now distinguish us into Parties, yet they can never be reasonably thought to exclude the Churches on either side from the Communion of the Church Universal, much less will they exclude the truly pious Members on either side from the Heavenly Society. How little then shou'd those Differences tend to *disunite* our affections, or to obstruct our amicable endeavours to advance the common Interest of *Practical Holiness*? How shou'd we Rejoyce to see this blessed Work prosper in each others hands? How entirely shou'd *Charity* govern all our Debates in the points wherein we disagree, and make us unwilling to misrepresent each others Opinions or Practices, when we calmly reason against 'em? How strongly shou'd it prompt us to treat each other in all respects as Brethren, in whom we behold the Image of our great Master, *tho* we may not see the *Inscriptions* of this or that Party, which we judge to be the most happily Reformed, or the best constituted and modell'd? How much more zealous shou'd we be to *promote* Men to the substance and power of Religion, then to any external Modes of Worship and Discipline? And how heartily shou'd we joyn in that Apostolical Benediction. *Grace be with all them that Love our Lord Jesus Christ in Sincerity*. Amen! 6 Eph. 24.